RAPPORT FINAL

AUTEUR: Prof. WILLIAM A. MORTON

SUJET: BICULTURALISM

Div. VIII-a Contrat no 4

FRITH

① Dev's · Pl.

② Hist. Fr. ac = CULTURE

③ " ENG

but DIFFT. - ENG - FR. SC. TO
CATH - PROT ac

④ ∴ SYMBIOTIC BICULTUR. - DUALITY

BICULTURALISM

W. L. Morton

BICULTURALISM

Definitions

It is first necessary to define, for the purposes of this paper, the two terms with which it is concerned, culture and biculturalism.

Culture is to-day both a scientific concept used precisely by anthropologists and sociologists[1] and a popular term used by publicists and politicians.[2] It will be used in this paper in the scientific sense, but with constant awareness of popular usage. The definition proposed for that particular use is that culture is the whole of the assumptions, beliefs, behaviour and expectancies of a given society. More briefly and simply, it is the way the people of a society behave individually and socially.[3] The underlying assumption is that culture teaches people how to behave and what to expect. Any culture, that is, is a way, a pattern, for individual and social behaviour. It is a way of life including and affecting all the life of society and all of the lives of its members. It does not determine all individual actions. Neither is it fixed and unchanging. Culture is the traditional and accepted pattern of life of a society, in which people live with assurance and which they make change as they may wish in any general and sustained way.

1. A.L.Kroeker and C.Kluckhorn, Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions (Cambridge, Mass. 1952)
2. T.S.Eliot, Notes Towards the Definition of Culture (London, 1948) pp. 13-14
3. Kroeker and Kluckhorn, A Critical Review, p. 157

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

[illegible]

It is [illegible] necessary to define, for the purposes of this paper, the two terms with which it is concerned, culture and material culture.

Culture is a key term a contentious concept used [illegible] by anthropologists and sociologists[1] and a popular term used by politicians and politicians.[2] It will be used in this paper in a scientific sense, but with constant awareness of popular usage. The definition proposed for that particular use is: that culture is the whole of the assumptions, beliefs, behaviour and expectations of a given society. More precisely and simply, it is the way the people of a society [illegible] individually and socially. The underlying assumption is that culture [illegible] people may be learned and when be expect. Any culture, also is a set, a pattern, for individual and social behaviour. It is a way of life including and stressing all the life of society and all of the lives of its members. It does not necessarily [illegible] rational actions. Neither is it fixed and unchanging. Elements of the traditional one accepted pattern of life of a society [illegible] people live with happiness and which they make [illegible] in any general and acceptable way.

1. [illegible] and C. Kluckhohn, [illegible] A Critical Review [illegible] Concepts and Definitions (Cambridge, Mass., 1952)

2. [illegible], Making the Definition of Culture [illegible] [illegible] pp. 13-14

3. [illegible] and Kluckhohn, A Textbook [illegible], p. 187

Culture, then, is the way the people of a particular society live, and in all aspects of their lives. Culture indeed does much, perhaps as much as any other factor, to make a society a society. Used in this comprehensive, sociological way, culture is not to be compared with another, older and quite legitimate usage, that meaning the personal refinement of a cultivated person. Such personal cultivation is indeed culture, and a person of cultivated mind and manners is a cultured personality. But such culture is only an extreme manifestation of social culture which, while it is fundamentally concerned with such matters as child-rearing and superficially with such matters as hockey playing, does because even such matters are matters of learning and of values, always concern itself with the cultivation of persons, their habits, goals and tastes.

If a clear and simple definition of culture is readily available, thanks to a century's labour by scholars and critics, it is by no means so with respect to biculturalism. In the first place, the word is an "-ism" word, a kind of word which always indicates a lack of certainty in thought, some obscurity of conception, and some throwing together of elements not yet reconciled and perhaps irreconcilable. Next the word is of recent coinage, and is as yet, the writer believes, restricted to use in Canada. It has as a consequence been so far subject to little criticism, and none of a scholarly kind. It thus springs not

Culture, then, is the way the people of a particular society live, and in all aspects of their lives. Culture indeed does much, perhaps as much as any other factor, to make a society a society. Used in this comprehensive, sociological way, culture is not to be compared with another, older and quite legitimate usage, that evoking the personal refinement of a multivated person. Such personal cultivation is indeed culture, and a person of cultivated mind and manners is a cultured personality. But such culture is only an extreme manifestation of social culture which, while it is fundamentally concerned with such matters as child-rearing and superficially with such matters as dancing, plays, these because even such matters are matters of learning and of values, always concern itself with the cultivation of persons, their habits, goals and tastes.

If a clear and simple definition of culture is readily available, thanks to a century's labour by scholars and writers, it is by no means so with respect to biculturalism. In the first place, the word is an "-ism" word, a kind of word which always indicates a lack of certainty in thought, some uncertainty of conception, and some blurring together of elements not yet correlated and perhaps irreconcilable. Even the word is of recent origin, and in its part, the writer believes, restricted to use in Canada. It has as a connotation been so far subject to little criticism, and none of a scholarly kind. It thus appears not

from careful and objective thought, but from immediate and pressing social needs. Any definition must therefore be tentative and provisional, and is in danger of being affected by the pressures from which the coinage arose.

The term biculturalism assumes the existences of two cultures in Canadian society. These are in fact described as being the culture of French Canada and the culture of English Canada. Let us leave aside for the moment the question of whether there are infact two, or some other number of cultures in Canada in the terms of the definition of culture adopted above. It is first necessary to point out that the "bi-" in biculturalism is concerned not only to state that there are two cultures in Canada. It is concerned, much more urgently it is reasonable to think, with implying that definite and active relations exist between the two cultures. The existence of relations between the cultures may be desirable or not. The important point, and the reason for the coinage of biculturalism, is that the two cultures are asserted to exist together in a special relationship described as biculturalism.

What, then, is biculturalism, and is it possible to define it in useful terms abstracted from the considerations and pressures that gave rise to the term? It does seem possible to do so. Biculturalism is the existence together of two distinct cultures, each with its own organic being, but both related to

from criteria and objectives thought, but from immediate and pressing social needs. Any definition must therefore be constantly and provisional, and is in danger of being attacked by the pressures from which the changes arose.

The term biculturalism envelopes the existence of two cultures in Canadian society. These are in fact identified as being the culture of French Canada and the culture of English Canada. Let us leave aside for the moment the question of whether there are indeed two, or some other number of cultures in Canada in the sense of the definition of culture adopted above. It is first necessary to point out that the "bi-" in biculturalism is concerned not only to state that there are two cultures in Canada. It is concerned, much more urgently at its rationale to think, with implying that conflict and active relations exist between the two cultures. The existence of relations between the cultures may be desirable or not. The important point, and the reason for the coinage of biculturalism, is that the two cultures are asserted to exist together in a special relationship described as biculturalism.

What, then, is biculturalism, and is it possible to define it usefully here abstracted from the comm-descriptions and prescriptions that give rise to the term? It does seem possible to do so. Biculturalism is the relationship between of two dominant cultures, each with its own organic being, but both related to

the other by many, but not the whole range, of the factors which constitute a culture.

Culture and Language

Because this paper is written as a contribution of the study of bilingualism and biculturalism, it will be useful, even although the subject of the paper is biculturalism alone, to say a word on bilingualism in relation to biculturalism.

Culture is both general and particular. It is proper to speak of European culture. There is a culture common to the various societies and nations of Europe because they share some important and fundamental elements: the Christian religion, an intellectual tradition, with its peculiar European development in science, a political and legal tradition, and even a literary one. Yet Europe possesses many languages fully developed in all respects, not to speak of a host of dialects. This common and shared aspect of culture indeed extends to cover the whole world. In some senses, one may speak of human culture. Nearly all human beings, for example, cook some portion of the food they eat.

Yet when a culture is particular to a definable society, such as French Canada, that culture will be associated with a particular language. The language will indeed be the most evident characteristic of the culture. It will be also its principal medium, its indispensable vehicle.

Language is an intimate part of a culture in the particular sense. This is a point upon which anthropologists and sociologists are agreed.[4]

The reason for this is clear. While a culture has numerous media of expression and transmission, language being the principal conscious medium of instruction and interchange, in child-rearing, in the family, in formal education, in religion and business, and all forms of social intercourse, is self-evidently the dominant mode of transmitting, enjoying, and modifying a culture.

The affinity of language and culture is also more subtle and intimate than the above statement conveys. A language and a culture grow together and interact. They are in fact two aspects of a single social tissue. To separate them is to mutilate and partly deaden each. A member of one language may learn the language of another. But only to the extent that he also learns the culture that goes with the language will he be able to enter the life of the people to whom the language is native. To the extent he does not, the language learned will be a mechanical accomplishment useful in a limited way, like translation by machine, but not a means of full exchange.

If culture and language, for the purpose of this paper, are inseparable, what is the relation of bilingualism to biculturalism? First, it is to be noted that bilingualism, is the

4. Kroeker and Kluckhorn, pp. 115-124

sense of members of both cultures have a working knowledge of the language of the other, is not, logically speaking, necessary to biculturalism. It is possible to conceive two cultures living side by side and carrying out all necessary interchange by means of translated documents and of simultaneous translation in conference. Such a relationship however, would be a stiff and remote one, such as obtained between the British Empire and the Chinese at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Two cultures could not exist together with any degree of intimacy or interchange.

Bilingualism is therefore, if a harmonious and fruitful relationship is to exist between two cultures, practically necessary to the concept of biculturalism, if by biculturalism is meant two cultures capable of living side by side and taking common action in certain respects, say, within a federal state.

Culture and Nationalism

That is of course what is meant by biculturalism in Canada, the co-existence of the two cultures, English and French, within the federal union of Canada. Such a concept, however, at once raises the question of the relations of culture to nationalism.

In this respect some public discussion has already risen as to whether there are not distinct meanings to be attached to the French word nationalisme and the English word "nationalism". Enquiry leads the writer to believe that there is no necessary difference in meaning. Like so many words common to English

and French, they have head a common ancestry. Unlike many other words common to English and French, long continued usage in both languages has not given rise to a difference in meaning. It is, however, true that in Canada French Canadians for historical reasons have come to use nationalisme in speaking of French Canada in a sense different from that in which English Canadians customarily use nationalism in speaking of Canada. In this paper therefore the word will be taken to have the same meaning in both languages, unless it is deliberately used in some modified sense. It will on such occasions be suitably modified.

Two such usages must be noted at this point. Indeed, taken together, they explain why confusion may arise in the use of "nationalisme" by French and English Canadians. Nationalism is both a cultural and a political phenomenon. There are thus cultural nationalism and political nationalism, and the question, is biculturalism a concept that will work in practice, must also be put in other terms: may cultural nationalism flourish within political nationalism expressed in a federal state?

To answer that question, the terms cultural nationalism and political nationalism must first be defined: What is meant by cultural nationalism? It is the assertion of the existence of the culture of a society by the members of that society. Culture is the fact; nationalism is the sentiment aroused by the fact. Cultural nationalism is the feeling of a member of a culture that he is French Canadian, for example, and not some-

one else, and as such has a right to exist and be accepted as a French Canadian. An English Canadian may experience similar feeling, either when he choses to reflect on the society in which he lives and its origins, or when he feels that the way in which he lives is challenged by the culture of another society.

That nationalism is thus a sentiment secondary to objective facts may be noted by resort to various examples. It is worth comment that present day interest in culture occurs at a time of great and of imminent even greater changes in the organization of the various human societies.[5]

The extraordinary dominance of the world by Europe from 1815 to 1939 has been followed by a reaction which has not only destroyed the European empires and European hegemony in the world, but has also been accompanied by the assertion of the worth of non-European cultures around the globe. Within Europe itself the same period saw the re-awakening and assertion of many cultures long buried, and the emergence or re-emergence of some as states. Czecho-Slovakia is perhaps the most remarkable of these. Others have had a purely cultural awakening, or even creation. The Ukrainian is the chief of these last. The Kievan state was the original Russia. Absorbed by Great Russia, Poland and Austria, its people, the Little Russians, or Ukrainians, were submerged for centuries. Yet a Ukrainian national revival was carried out, for a brief period had its own state in 1917-1921, and as a sentiment still exists, although that state was destroyed, and is not kept up even in exile. Yet there can be no

5. Eliot, Notes, p.83

question of the reality of Ukrainian culture and of Ukrainian national sentiment. Such is cultural nationalism.

The elements of sentiment and assertion, and of submergence and challenge, are to be marked. So also is the role of language in cultural revival and national assertion. There is indeed a tendency for societies which have established themselves and achieved full cultural and political expressions as nation states to put cultural matters second and political first. France, England and China perhaps are the classic examples of this. Societies which have had unhappy histories, such as Germany, or have been submerged by the rule of other societies, such as the Ukrainian, tend to emphasize culture more and politics less. Cultural nationalism thus tends to be most evident in those societies which have in one way or another been subordinated, or absorbed, into another, such as the Welsh, or the French Canadian.

Nationalism as a political phenomenon accordingly belongs more to societies which have achieved full expression in political order and national freedom. It may be, of course, that political nationalism goes hand in hand in the demand for national liberty and unification, as in the Italian Risorgimento. But the stress on political nationalism rather than on cultural nationalism may be taken to mark a more advanced stage in the full expression of a society's life than does cultural nationalism alone. It is therefore most significant that the French Canadian

by the use of the term nationalism has referred to cultural nationalism, while the English Canadian by the word means political nationalism. The sentiment of the two with respect to the significance and nature of nationalism differ because the French Canadian challenges the existing order in Canada, the English Canadian accepts it.

A further question arises at this point. What is the relation between culture and politics? Culture is the way a people lives, and will be so treated in this paper. There is, however, more than that to be said about the relation in these times. Because most political order is being questioned, because the question, or the challenge, arises from cultures and sub-cultures, there is a marked tendency at the present time for politics to become divorced from culture. This is in fact the inner significance of both imperialism and of tolitarian politics. Those who govern are separated from those governed either by a cultural gap, if imperial rulers, or by a self-consciousness in the totalitarians of politics as an art of manipulation separate from the moral restraints a culture imposes on the governors as well as the governed.

This gap between politics and culture in a society is of the gravest import. Culture is somewhat like innocence; awareness destroys it. Once the politicians become aware of the culture of his society as a political factor, the danger at once

arises that he will seek to exploit, control and direct it. But culture is not political in the sense that public sanitation may be. It is rather to be equated with private habits, personal beliefs, individual tastes. Such may be helped and sustained by maintaining good political order and a favourable economic environment. So may culture. But it can only be nourished; it cannot be directed and controlled. A managed culture is unthinkable; a sustained culture is not, and the nurture of culture by government is in fact to be desired.

The autonomy of culture, then, is to be recognized. If it is autonomous, however, it is also to be observed that there is a real distinction between cultural nationalism and political. Each exists in its own right and has its own functions to discharge. Cultural nationalism need not become political nationalism; political nationalism does not need to hamper, restrict or distort cultural nationalism.

The Culture of French Canada

There can be no question that the society of French Canada, particularly in the Province of Quebec, is a distinct and recognizable society. It is equally beyond question that that society possesses a distinct and easily recognizable culture. It is now necessary to examine the nature of that culture, its origins and the influences under which it has developed and lives at present.

The ancestors of to-day's French Canadians came from France

in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as fishermen, labourers under contract, soldiers, convicts, religious, officials, and as settlers on the land. Most of the latter were peasants from the country and artisans from the towns. Some were men of standing and means who were granted seigneuries and as seigneurs were in charge of settlement with the hope of drawing rents as well as status from their position. There is little evidence that they came with any intention or much expectation of creating or finding a new society in America. They, perhaps even the convicts among them, accepted the social order from which they came, and had no fundamental opposition to its being recreated on the banks of the St. Lawrence. New France was to be old France carried across the Atlantic. It was not, like New England, to be the old society reformed and made new.

It may not, of course, be said that a cross section of the society of France was planted in America. Very few of noble blood came, few of the substantial middle class, commercial and professional. Those of the lower orders who migrated must in most instances have been among the less fortunate of their class. No one at all well established in pleasant France would, unless for very personal reasons, leave that country for the long winters and heavy forests of Canada, or even the sea-meadows of Acadia. (To say this is not to comment on their quality as human beings. Anyone may be unfortunate, and parti-

cularly so in a rigid class society in which all land is held and occupations are few.)

The immigrants, then, were mostly drawn from the peasantry and working class of France. They were directed by soldiers and officials drawn from the nobility and the professions, and ministered to by priests and men drawn from the same classes. They therefore readily formed the same kind of society, rural and urban, as they had left behind a class society of habitants, town artisans, merchants, professional men, and state officials, with the clergy spiritual analogues of the professional men and the officials.

Every student of French Canadian society knows, however, that the society of old and New France are by no means to be identified. Nothing, even when called by the same name, was ever quite the same. The habitant was not a peasant. The fewness of his numbers and the abundance of land ensured he should not be. The cure was not amoveable as in France; the missionary character of the Church ensured that. Old France had no official to compare with the capitaine de milice; the Indian wars had insured the French townsmen and women were not as free and bold as those of Canada; the goldrush-like quality of the fur trade had emancipated them from the prudence of bourgeois life.

Yet when all the differences are recorded, and it is important to record them, the fact remains that in its values and

behaviour the society of French Canada was essentially the same as that of France itself. It was catholic, conservative, hierarchical and paternalistic.

In the re-creation of French society on this side of the Atlantic no force was as strong or pervasive as that of the Roman Catholic church. It need not have been so. The early adventurers to New France were Huguenots. The Father of New France himself, Samuel de Champlain, may have come from Huguenot origins. Yet the Church, backed by the state moulded by Cardinal Richelieu, was easily strong enough to end Huguenot trading and settlement in New France, and made the colony in 1628-32, legally and actually a colony of Roman Catholics only. New France thus became an offshoot of the Catholic Revival that had begun in the mid-seventeenth century, and which was to stop the spread of Protestantism in the Thirty Years' War. The religious wars had divided Europe into Catholic and Protestant powers, as it had divided Germany into Catholic and Protestant states. All the Americas were in consequence divided into Catholic and Protestant colonies, the English and Dutch forming a wedge after 1607 between those of France and Spain. New France was firmly in the Catholic camp, with all that meant for the development of its society and culture.

The Catholic Revival, moreover, was not only political; it was even more spiritual, and the religious orders which sprang from the enthusiasm of the revival were missionary orders which carried the Roman faith not only into the courts and villages of European heretics and schismatics, but into the cities of India and China and the forests of New France. Of these orders the Society of Jesus was incomparably the greatest and most effective.

In 1628 the Jesuits were given, because of their organization and wealth, the full responsibility for missionary work among the natives of New France, and of ministering to its French people. The Church in New France thus began as primarily a mission church under the greatest of the missionary orders, and its Catholicism, rigid, severe and enthusiastic, in consequence strongly impressed the formative years of the colony.

In the eighteenth century this fervent spirit was to diminish. The missionary work became relatively less important, and the work of regular ministrations more important as the colony increased in population. Jesuit strength and enthusiasm waned. The Church itself retired from its position of pre-eminence in the seventeenth century and became more like the Church in France, the sympathetic and unassertive colleague of the state. There was even some infiltration of the spirit of Rationalism and of the <u>philosophes</u>.

Yet the direct tie with Rome remained, and was to be renewed, paradoxically, after the cession to England. The Church remained a missionary church, with its charge of carrying the gospel to the Indians never wholly neglected. And the French Canadians remained a catholic people, not only in the rural parishes but even in Montreal and Quebec. Little real anti-clericalism showed itself before the French Revolution. In this light, the light of cultural history, Francis Parkman's epic thesis of a contest of Protestant liberalism and Catholic conservatism in the French wars remains historically valid.

The same story is to be told of politics in colonial New France. There was even a similar element of fervency, because the institutions of the colony, adopted from those of a royal province of France, were created and at first administered with the spirit that Louis XIV had brought to the centralization of the French state in the hands of the monarchy. The result was that the government of New France, though divided between governor and _intendant_, was centred in the King and his ministers. It was in consequence the kind of government Bishop Bossuet had lauded and Louis XIV had practised, royal, centralized, benevolent and paternal. It was moreover exercised through a hierarchy of officials, all appointed by the King or his agents, down to the _capitaines de milice_. No collective representation

of the people was allowed; New France never had a parlement of estates, as no royal province ever had. Yet the King was under God the servant of his people. It was his solemn duty to render justice and do mercy. His government in New France was in part intensely personal and human, the officers were usually approachable; they could be induced to be reasonable by plea or favour; they knew and were accepted by the people they governed.

The state in French Canadian society and culture was therefore never in its origins a popular possession or subject to public will. But it was human and paternalistic; even its faults were understood and allowed for. It was the subject to the unbelievable corruption of the French regime during the Seven Years' War. Yet it was never rejected or revolted against, because the King could be expected to punish evil agents, as indeed he did, and because in the last analysis the French state was a government of men who could be understood, approached, and even succeeded. This government reflected the Latin view of politics, of the patron and his clients, as old as Latin culture itself, and it took hold firmly in New France, which it was long to survive.

External Influences

The society of French Canadafrom its inception came under influences different from those to which its parent society was subjected; it remains under them to-day, and is thus a French

society with great and important differences. To understand the situation and characteristics of French Canadian society and culture to-day, it is necessary to review the external influences to which they have been subjected before turning to a fuller examination of the development of their own inherent nature.

The first of such influences may be described as Anglo-American. The hyphenated term is used because the influences were partly geographical and partly human. The chief - though not the only - human influence was English. The geographical was of course North American. In the course of time even the human influence became Anglo-American as the colonies themselves began to affect New France. The term Anglo-American thus carries a dual, although not, it is hoped, an ambiguous meaning.

More immediate influences were the continental. They consisted of the relative abundance of opportunity, with labour scarce and dear, the choice between artisan labour, farming and the fur trade, and the overwhelming abundance of cheap, almost free and readily accessible land. The effects were liberating, and affected both the society of New France and the psychology of French Canadians. Society was in practice less hierarchical, and movement within classes much easier than in France. It became, relatively speaking a society of improving status, of rising men, or of men who might hope to rise. Social position was not necessarily fixed. Men became self-reliant, aggressive,

less docile. Women exercised the freedom even the old society had allowed them with greater ease and boldness.

This now well established fact continued to change the functioning of French Canadian society after the cession. Even although British rule closed the very top positions of trust to French Canadians for two generations after 1760, it did not close all after 1774, and by 1840 all that were open to a colonial of any origin were open also to French Canadians. By 1850 this fact was beyond all doubt. The one office not so open was that of governor-general, and that was closed to all Canadians until recent times. Thus the combined influence of geography and the English connection was to make French Canadian society looser intexture than that of old France before the Revolution. After the Revolution the advance of French Canadians to high political office was delayed by the distrust of innovation caused by the French Revolution in governing circles in England, and then by a result of that distrust, the Rebellion of 1837. Soon after the Union of 1840, however, the movement of French Canadian society towards full participation in political, professional and even business life was resumed. While no balance can be struck, it is difficult to see that, despite the Anglo-American conquest in 1760, the overall advance of French Canadians towards self-government in nineteenth century terms was in fact much delayed beyond that of other British North American colonials, or that they would have made in other circumstances.

No really comparable French colony exists to be used as a yardstick.

More subtle than any political Anglo-American influence on public life was that on the private lives of French Canadians. Such influence, it may be guessed, did operate, and was at once less important immediately, but very important in the long run. Political thought seems to have drawn more from Anglo-American sources than from French, or others, despite the French influence on the later Papineau and the Rouges. Economic thought, with the same exception seems to have been almost wholly British and laissez-faire. One aspect of this, the family business with its human ties was to survive much longer in French society than in Anglo-American, with the result that this form of business enterprise was to encounter the difficulties it did in Anglo-American, but without being replaced by corporate business firms. The one exception to their petty bourgeois and laissez-faire thought , a determination to use customs duties as almost the only mode of taxation, and also a readiness to add to such taxation a measure of protection, was an exception shared with most of their fellow colonials of other origins. Literary and intellectual influences seem to have been more French than other, perhaps because those influences found expression in French. Whether they were substantially so may be doubted before the rise of Louis Fréchette, with his conscious modelling of his work on that of Hugo. No direct English or

American influence is, it is true, to be detected, but the pervading literary and intellectual climate was romantic, and at least as much Anglo-American as French, until confederation. After that date direct French influence came to prevail. In the plastic arts, particularly wood carving, old traditions, however, prevailed, and were to flow directly into modern French influences.

In another field, that of science and technology, Anglo-American influence was to be constant and dominant. French colonists of course had brought many artisan skills to New France. They took over Indian ones, as in canoe-building, and developed new ones in the fur trade. Some major industries were carried on, such as iron-making and saw milling. But the later Industrial Revolution came to French Canada wholly from England and the United States. The timber trade was tied to the Industrial Revolution in England by the closing of the Baltic in 1807, and to that in the United States by the Reciprosity Treaty of 1854. Mining, the development of hydro-electrical power, and the making of wood pulp, developed to serve the British or the American markets. In all this French Canadian society was passive; it initiated nothing, and saw its traditional society pulled into the vortex of an industrial economy which strained every fibre of its social tissue. With the coming

of the Industrial Revolution to Canada with the railway in the 1850's, and the beginning of industrial manufacturing in the 1860's, French Canada came under the greatest of Anglo-American influences, one it would not have escaped in any circumstances, but one that as it came was to be irresistible and overwhelming after 1900.

The effect was to challenge every principle of behavior in that society. An agrarian society resting on the farm and on seasonal labour, a Catholic society organized around the parish and the family, a society of which the _élite_ was professional, clerical, legal and medical, a society _laissez-faire_ in economic and political thought, it was totally unequipped to deal with the changes implied in industrial production and a mobile urban society. These characteristics, moreover, were part of its very structure, built in its system of education, its civil law, its whole cast of thought.

Akin to the Anglo-American influence, but to be discussed separately because it was at once an influence internal to Canada as a whole and also external to French Canadian society and because it was more immediate and initially more intense, was what may be called British influence. This influence first exerted itself as the conquest and cession of New France. The conquest was for Anglo-American ends and carried out by Anglo-American arms, but the cession was to the crown of Great Britain. British officers governed, and British troops garrisoned Canada after the conquest, and the American Revolution

left Canada British with direct American influence ended for the time being.

The conquest is the dilemma of Canadian history. To British Canadians it was a great victory and a glorious event; to French Canadians it was a tragedy. How are British and French Canadians ever to see it in the same light and with mutual understanding, if never with the same sentiment? An answer has yet to be found. But it may be suggested that in the frank and full acceptance and implementation of bilingualism and biculturalism by both English and French it may be found. And it may be said that if historically the conquest imposed British rule on French Canada, the American Revolution placed English and French on the same footing in America. Each became identified with the evolution of the British North American colonies of the Empire.

The conquest, moreover, was only superficially a military and even less a legal and social conquest. It was an episode in a war for mercantile empire, and the victors assumed that the people transferred would be absorbed into an extended empire. These assumptions were not realized, but the conquest did lead to French Canada being brought within the mercantile orbit of Great Britain. The immediate consequences of this for French Canadian society are a matter of debate among French Canadian historians to-day. Whatever they may have been in the short

run, in the long run the consequence was to reinforce the Anglo-American economic influence on French Canadian society. The greater part of commerce, and an increasingly greater part, passed into British hands and under British control. French Canadian society thus had to exist in an economic community directed by other people than themselves in the main, and guided by values different in important respects, such as family obligations, from those of the society itself.

Somewhat the same thing happened in law and government. The social survival of French Canada combined with the pressure of Imperial needs to preserve the French civil law for the French Canadians. Thus a very important part of French society, its outer tissue, so to speak, was preserved. In government, however, its own peculiar institutions vanished, the office of _intendant_, and that of the _capitaine de milice_. When representative government was granted in 1792, French Canadians welcomed and used their representation, and with English Canada made it into a means of realizing political democracy. Naturally and inevitably, nevertheless, French Canadian society used representative and democratic institutions for its own purposes and in its own spirit. Anglo-Saxon political institutions did not make it an Anglo-Saxon society.

Just how French Canada has used British political institutions is difficult to say, either for an English or a French Canadian. The matter awaits study. It may be suggested, however,

that the new forms of government did not change the attitude of French Canada towards government in any profound way.

The new middle class that arose after 1800 and the habitant voters used the mechanics of representative government deftly and vigorously. But in spirit government remained to them something external to their own society. It lacked the benevolent paternalism of pre-conquest government, but it was still to be approached in the same way, if by new means, as the fountain of favours, office and honour. The Latin concept of patron and client remained. The patron was now the party leader, the clients the party members.

No comment, favourable, or disparaging, is meant by the above observation, and no comparison of English with French attitudes to government. They are different, and the difference is to be found in the values of the two societies, the two cultures.

Subjected to Anglo-American and British influences, French Canadian society was all but isolated from those of Europe. It is likely that there were more family and personal ties between France and French Canada than are known; family letters, personal travel to Paris or to Rome, the sale of books, the passage of priests and lay travellers, such as Alexis de Tocqueville to Canada. But it was not until after 1837 that connections became numerous and well known. The exile of Papineau and his transmission of advanced political ideas to Canada is the best known

example. Others are the return of the Society of Jesus in the 1840's and the coming of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate in the same decade to the Northwest. The former carried the seeds of ultramontane thought, the latter carried beyond Red River into the far reaches of Canada the missionary work of the early Church in Canada. From this time too, the 1830's and 1840's, begins with the work of Octave Crèmazié the influence of the French romantics on the thought and literature of French Canada.

Of direct political influence there was practically none. Some stirring of national sentiment was caused by the visit of the frigate La Capriceuse from the Empire of the third Napoleon in 1855. The founding of the first French consulate at Quebec in 1858, and the visit incognito of the Prince Napoleon in 1859 followed this renewal of formal contacts with old France. But beyond arousing some British watchfulness and adding to the social life of Quebec, these two events seem not to have influenced the course of French Canadian society, or affected its culture. French and other European influences, even that of the Papacy as in the recruiting of Papal Zouaves in Canada, remained, except of course in the life of the Church itself, intermittent and slight down to 1870. Thereafter events were to reveal how susceptible French Canadian society could be to European influence, particularly in a religious guise. French Canadian society had been Catholic from its foundation. It had remained socially

Catholic under the conquest and in the warm glow of Victorian liberalism. After 1870 its national sentiment and its inherent conservatism were to be intensified by the influence of ultramontane clerical thought, drawn from France and Italy. French Canadian society revealed itself as being capable of a national feeling that went beyond a sentiment for the local patrie and the ties of kinship. This was a nationalisme intègrale that was chiefly aroused by a strain of Catholic thought and sentiment drawn from Europe and nourished by a powerful segment of the Church in French Canada. This may be understood by looking at the role of Catholicism in French Canadian culture.

Catholicism in French Canadian Culture

It must first be understood that by Catholicism is meant here not the doctrine and discipline, the faith and ritual, of the Roman Catholic church, but the habits of mind and behaviour which the Church insensibly as well as deliberately instils in all who grow up under the influence, particularly when the influence of the Church is as strong and pervasive as it was in French Canadian society until the present generation. These habits and the outlook on the world that goes with them persist even when the faith and observances of the Church are set aside. It follows that even secular elements in French Canadian society, even anti-catholic elements, are still catholic in their formation and working. An atheistic and materialistic French Canadian society would still to some degree be catholic.

This strong formation of French Canadian culture by its religious history, as is well known, derives from the fervour of its religious origin as in part as a mission to the Indians. The Church as quite as much, even more perhaps, of the European assault on the American wilderness as the clearing of the forest for farms itself was. To this fervour was added a certain rigour comparable with that Calvinism gave the New England colonies. It derived indirectly from Jansenism, for the suppression of that austere variant of French Catholicism gave to the orthodox Catholicism that suppressed it more than a trace of its own austerity. French Canadian Catholicism began with and continued a double strain of exaltation and puritanism that made it a formidable agent of cultural formation. This tradition of social discipline is a constant and fundamental feature of French Canadian life.

These original features were to be softened, but not lost in the eighteenth century. Then came the severance from France caused by the conquest. This proved not to be a severance from Rome. The Church in New France thus became more Roman and more French Canadian. Indeed it became to a degree what it had never been before, and until modified by the French clerical influences in the mid-nineteenth century, was pre-eminently a native French Canadian Church. It is true that this quality was to make it peculiarly susceptible to ultramontane influence in the nineteenth

century. The direct tie with Rome and the long isolation from the mother culture accounts for this, as they also account for the extraordinarily intimate connection that existed between the Church and French Canadian society. While a tradition of liberal and nationalistic thought flourished in the two great cities, the Church and French Canadian society were bone of the same bone and flesh of the same flesh.

The influence of ultramontane thought became marked in French Canada in the 1850's. Its champion among French Canadian clerics was Ignace Bourget, Bishop and Archbishop of Montreal, 1840 to 1885. The spirit of ultramontane thought was made when it made itself the champion of Roman Catholicism in the conflict with the liberal and free thinking Institut Canadien of Montreal in 1858. (The existence of that body is a further comment on French Canadian culture which will be developed below.) The Institut was banned by Bishop Bourget that year and its members threatened with excommunication should they defy the ban, as some did. One of these was Joseph Guibord. Guibord was excommunicated and died so in 1870. There followed the famous Guibord affair, which became a straight contest between the power of the church and state, the power of the church to control its members beliefs and morals, the power of the state to assure its citizens the civil rights belonging to all without respect to religious affiliation. The result was a draw. Guibord's body was buried by court decree in a Roman Catholic cemetery: Bourget deconsecrated the ground in which the body lay.

In French Canada ultramontane influence created clericalism, the assertion that the church is equal with the state, and in its own domain of faith and morals is autonomous. A practical consequence could be the exercise of clerical influence in secular matters, such as politics, or scientific study. More important was the assertion of the autonomous moral rights of the family, and of the individual as a member of a family and of the church, in wide areas of life, such as education.

When so wide arranging a claim for the autonomy of the religious sphere of life fused, as it did in the 1870's, with the repercussions of the Red River Insurrection and the publication of the clerical political platform called Le Programme, with French Canadian nationalist sentiment, the result was to create a nationalisme integrale, a nationalism which was not merely sentimental and political, but religious, familial and even racial. Such a nationalism not only challenged the state in the abstract over much of society; it implicitly challenged the nature of the general society of Canada.

The effects of the fusion of ultramontanism and nationalism must await some discussion of nationalism in French Canada after 1848. But it is necessary to note that this clerical nationalism was fed not only by events in Canada after 1900, but by the influence of the rise of the League for Catholic Action and the writings of its intellectual leader, Charles Maurras. In the first four decades of the present century, therefore, the catholicism of French Canadian society was intensified by the influence

both of ultramontane thought, the doctrine of the autonomy of the state, but was strengthened by a powerful French example of Catholics taking political action for Catholic purposes. The result was to make French Canadian national sentiment not merely a French version of English Canadian national sentiment; it was to make it something quite different, so different as to imply, and demand, the need for a separate existence.

Before, however, the nationalism of French Canada in the present century is examined, it is necessary to touch on the growth of French Canadian national sentiment *per se*. It is also necessary to note here that the role of the Church has altered greatly in recent years, and that change must be taken in account before conclusions are to be drawn about the nature of French Canadian culture to-day.

Nationalism in French Canada

The national sentiment of French Canada is twofold. It is the first place inherent and self-conscious, a matter of sentiment, speech and kindred. It was the nationalism of the *habitant* and the bourgeois, French and also Canadian. This was the original and colonial nationalism, of which writers in the eighteenth century speak. It was second conscious, cultivated and assertive, a matter not only of racial feeling but also of class structure and the evolution of a literate and professional élite. It was, in short, the claim to recognition and status of the lawyer, the

politician, the journalist; the middle class growing up from the soil of the basically agrarian society of farm and parish, of market town and harbour city.

It was the former national sentiment which Durham mistook for peasant apathy, and which he offended by dismissal of the possibility of any future for French Canadian nationality on an Anglo-American continent. That a man of such insight and of humanitarian sympathies so radical could have been so mistaken and so wounding must give one pause. That it was a blindness in Durham is evident; that it indicates the failure of French Canadians to win a hearing from the English except by rebellion is probable. French Canadian nationalism, both the fundamental and the conscious, had failed to find any expression that commanded a hearing. Papineau was a light and wordy demagogue, not an effective voice of French Canadian sentiment.

That voice was provoked by Durham's curt dismissal of French Canadian sentiments and pretensions. In F. X. Garneau's burning Histoire du Canada, in the talk, the book selling, the poetry of Octave Crèmazié, French Canadians had their past presented in heroic prose, their sentiments, their aspirations, their comment on life, given the wit and edge of verse. A literature, the indispensable cement of nationalism had taken root, and was to flourish.

Literature is the flame by which mankind's chief passions burn, and in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, during which men have moved into ever closer community one with another, the chief apparent result of that intensified community, has been the growth of the passion of nationalism. Literature has served this passion in French Canada as strongly as it has any other human society. That French Canadian society has been increasingly able to serve all its needs for expression, information and reflection by its own output in prose and verse, is the surest vindication of its cultural autonomy.

Yet politics is perhaps an even more effective and inflammatory expression of national feeling. The artist is moderated by form, the thinker by reflection. The politician works in the raw, al fresco. His own thought is at best calculated for effect, his speech is meant to move, rather than persuade, his strongest appeal is to sentiment at its crudest and most emotional, rather than to reason. The nationalist and class politician is particularly likely to appeal to emotion. The cause of an oppressed nationality, or of an oppressed class, gives to the politician a theme and an audience, the theme of injustice and an audience of those conscious of the injustice of alien rule or class exploitation. The French Canadian could readily feel after 1760 and 1837 that his was a suppressed, if not an oppressed nationality. He could point to class exploitation, as the surging rural population of Lower Canada filled the seigneurial lands, and the seigneur, Scots Canadian capitalists as often as not, grew

for seigneurial obligations now long forgotten. To ardent young men, perhaps not sure of their future in a crowded world, the liberal nationalism of the Revolution of 1848, with its strong undercurrent of socialism, was, as proclaimed by Papineau on his return from exile in France, an exciting and a fitting gospel. From French radical thought, as it had welled up to cause the Revolution, came le parti rouge, radical, nationalist, and anti-clerical. It was as distinct and as important, if not as influential, an influence from old France as had been the return of the Jesuits and the coming of ultramontane conservatism in the same decade of the 1840's.

These two strains of thought and passion from revolution-divided France of the nineteenth century, radical and anti-clerical nationalism and conservative and clerical ultramontanism, were of course deliberate and bitter antagonists.

Their conflict was led for the Rouges by the Dorion brothers, the impeccable lawyer, A. A. Dorion, and his brother, "l' enfant terrible", Jean-Baptiste Eric Dorion, for the ultramontanes by Bishops Bourget of Montreal and La Flêche of Trois Rivières. The Rouge Institut Canadien, as already noted, led to their mutual combat of 1858 and the Guibord affair of 1870-1877.

The strife, however, was a fratricidal one within French Canadian society. Each party to it was an essential element in that society. For it is a characteristic of any Roman Catholic

society, and particularly of one so intensely catholic as that of French Canada, that it produces at its extremes clericals and anti-clericals. The dispute is over the place of organized religion and of the cleric in society. Yet so pervading is catholicism, with its disciplined insistence on reason, order and hierarchy in society, that even the radical and anti-clerical son of such a society is formed in all its essential traits, and is himself what he fights. Even though not a Catholic, he is catholic in its abstract and sociological sense. The common factor of catholicism find expression in nationalism, a nationalism held by both parties.

In this fact lies the basis for the union under a common pressure of the two kinds of nationalism. That pressure was furnished for French Canadian society by Confederation and its sequel of the annexation of the West as far as the Pacific to the Dominion of Canada. Confederation itself had sealed the reduction of the position of French Canadian society from that of a majority of Canadians in 1841, the time of the Union, to that of a minority both in old Canada and the new Dominion in 1867. It was a guaranteed position, it is true, with explicit legal rights given the French language and law in the homeland of the Province of Quebec and in the parliament and courts of the Dominion.[6] But it was a minority position, none the less, and Dorion and the Rouges had as nationalists opposed Confederation

6. P.W.Waite, "The Quebec Resolution and Le Courrier du Canada," Canadian Historical Review, XL (4) Dec., 1959, reveals how differently confederation was understood in French and English Canada.

as an over-riding of French society in the interests of English Canadian capitalism and political supremacy.

Nor was that all that was, from the nationalist point of view, to be suffered. These were peripheral matters. The Acadian French had never enjoyed any of the rights of French Canadians held and increased from the conquest on. Their religious educational rights at Confederation were recent and rested on a slender legal basis. The thousands of French who were moving across the Ottawa into the Province of Ontario had no right to French civil law, no right to the use of their language except federally, and only the rights conceded all Roman Catholics in the legislation providing for separate schools. These educational rights held by Roman Catholics by law at the time of union were safeguarded by Section 93 of the British North America Act of 1867, but they were, such as they were, privileges accorded to members of a religion, not to those of a linguistic nationality.

More fundamental to the development of the future was the fact that French Canadians had not taken part in the great popular movement of the nineteenth century in North America, the settlement and exploitation of the West. French Canadian settlement had constantly remained peripheral to the original occupation of the valley of the lower St. Lawrence. It had flowed into the Lake St. John basin, into the Eastern Townships, around the Gaspé peninsula, and even into New Brunswick. It had crept like a tide onto the terraces and along the valleys and

lake basins of the Laurentians to the north. The same tide was seeping into Ontario along the Ottawa. Surplus labour went to the mills of Massachusetts. But few French Canadians had gone to the West as the fur traders and the voyageurs had once done. In Red River and across the prairies and mountains there were only a few French Canadians. Far more numerous, and restless as quicksilver, were the descendants of French Canadian "freemen" and their Indian wives, the mètis.

These primitive people proud and free in their own semi-nomadic way of life, suddenly became the representatives of the "French element" in the new West of Canada. They shared with French Canadians French blood and French speech in part, and the Catholic religion. But they were the "missionary interest" of French Canada in the West, and that interest, though mainly supported from old France, had important direct and common ties with French Canada. One of these was Bishop Alexandre Taché of St. Boniface; another was the younger Louis Riel of Red River. Through these men and their ties with both the mètis and French Canada, the annexation of Rupert's Land to Canada became as well as a transfer of sovereignty over territory a question of the relation of English Canadian and French Canadian society in the West, and so of course in Canada as a whole.

The resistance of the mètis in 1870 against annexation to Canada without terms won for the French element in Red River, and in the territories a guarantee of language and educational rights

which were parallel with those of Quebec. The educational rights came under Section 93 with the addition of the words, "or custom." The principle of biculturalism, as recognized in the B. N. A. Act of 1867,was thus extended to Canada between the eastern boundary of Manitoba and the watershed of the Rockies. Canada had made yet another attempt, reluctantly and with much bitter opposition on the part of elements in Ontario, to incorporate two societies, the French Canadian and the English Canadian, into one political union.

The attempt rested on fragile foundations. The one essential condition of success, that French Canadians should migrate in numbers to the prairies, failed in spite of great efforts by Bishop Taché and the French Roman Catholic Church in the West. The very rootedness of French Canadian society in Quebec helped to bring about the failure to make the new Canada or the West become what the old Canada of the St. Lawrence had been, a dual society in political union.

This was the essential failure, a failure to be explained in terms of English Canadian resistance to the spread of French Canadian society as well as to the character of French Canadian society itself. The British stress on political uniformity clashed directly with the French attempt to maintain cultural duality. The failure declared itself in events only too well known. The tragic and largely pointless rebellion on the

Saskatchewan in 1885 set off a train of consequences in Quebec and throughout Canada that destroyed the attempt at biculturalism of 1870, and drove the secular and clerical wings of French Canadian nationalism together. The execution of Riel for his part in the rebellion was followed by the rise of Honoré Mercier, a former Rouge nationalist, to the premiership of Quebec at the head of a grouping of Rouge and clerical politicians. This capture of Quebec by nationalism, and Mercier's legislation in the matter of the Jesuit Estates, then set in train the Protestant agitation which led to the abolition of the official use of French and the replacement of a Protestant and Roman Catholic school system by a state school system in Manitoba in 1890. The attempt at biculturalism in the West was ended except for the survival of what were in effect separate schools in the territories, of which the southern part became in 1905 the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.

While peace was restored in Manitoba and the country by the very limited schools compromise and the intervention of the Papacy in 1897 the principle of biculturalism as attempted in 1870 was defeated. Canada had become a country of political uniformity except as qualified by provincial laws, in the federal Parliament and courts and in the Province of Quebec. These legal decisions, however, did little to modify actual social conditions.

In nearly all provinces the Roman Catholic Church, English as well as French, kept up the pressure for Roman Catholic schools. And in Quebec nationalism continued to grow, despite the fall of Mercier because of political scandals in 1893, and the shift of the French Canadians' majority of voters in federal politics from the Bleu to the Rouge camp, from support of the national Conservative to the national Liberal party.

The conviction and insistence of French Canadian society on its social autonomy and distinctive role in Canadian political society found a political voice in Henri Bourassa. A grandson of Papineau, a scion of a seigneurial family, well read, eloquent and a forceful writer, Bourassa was a distinguished member of the French Canadian professional middle class, and carried that fine touch of the patricate the cultured French Canadian so easily acquires. Early in his political life he challenged, not the political leadership of Wilfrid Laurier, that Canadian Liberal by Gladstone out of the Rouges, but his leadership, his position as the paternal chef, of French Canadian society. It was a mortal challenge, and was to lead Laurier to one of the most fateful decisions in Canadian history, his decision to oppose the introduction of conscription in 1917. Bourassa made this challenge, not of calculation but of inner necessity, while still a young man, in his opposition to the sending by Canada of an expeditionary force to the Boer War. The basis of his opposition was his belief that Canada was being used for purposes not its own, but Britain's, by Joseph Chamberlain and the neo-imperialism that had arisen in England and in

Canada.

In it also was a sympathy, natural to a French Canadian, and to recur more vehemently in the present day, to the imposition of an external will on a small people seeking to maintain its identity. But the essential fact was that Bourassa was affirming that in the making of any general policy for Canada, the voice and the sentiments of French Canada must be heard and considered, must indeed be part of such policy. This was a new affirmation, for it cannot be said, unless it was by Cartier in Confederation, that French Canada had ever insisted on a positive and unmuted voice in national policy before.

Such a stand was in fact one of hope for a revival of the concept of a political union based on cultural duality. The founding of Le Devoir, which became and has remained the voice of thoughtful French Canadian nationalism, was a necessary part of that assumption of the right of French Canada to speak its mind without fear or apology. The position Bourassa assumed was quite compatible with the then existing Canadian union. He spoke, not for Quebec, but for French Canada everywhere, and he was both French and Canadian, and also Canadian. His was, indeed, the first all-Canadianism the country had seen, the first Canadian sentiment to include French Canada as it really was, and all Canada as it might be.

Bourassa's Canadianism, however, as well as his French nationalism, collided head on with the fact that outside the Province of Quebec French Canadian society had little of the

autonomy it enjoyed within Quebec. French was no longer an official language anywhere outside Quebec and the federal Parliament and courts. The civil law had not existed outside Quebec since 1792. Where French Canadians enjoyed something of the kind of schools they wished as Roman Catholics, it was as Roman Catholics, not as French Canadians, that they enjoyed them. They had no right in law, except in Manitoba in defined circumstances down to 1916, to have their children taught in French.

Teaching in French, however, had been carried in the early years in the numerous and populous settlements of French Canadians in Ontario. The not unnatural result was that French Canadian children grew up as French Canadians and French Canadian society continued to exist in Ontario. Such an outcome seemed a contradiction, even a defiance of the prevalent concept of Ontario as a "British" province, and it might be thought, for quite liberal and humanitarian reasons, to create a barrier to social advance by French Canadian young people, as the high schools and universities, as well as posts in business and teaching were open only to those who spoke English. And the religious animosity of Orange Protestantism to any advance of Catholicism was of course a constant and an active force in support of the concept of "British"nationality, and a uniform state school system, one in authority, one in language of instruction, and "neutral"in religion.

Instruction in French in the schools of Ontario was stopped by Regulation 17 issued by the Ontario Department of Education in 1913. It was a flat denial of the concept that French Canadian society might grow and maintain itself in any part of Canada. It was a flat denial of the validity of Bourassa's pan-Canadianism, his concept of two societies enjoying full expression in one political nation. He had therefore to oppose Regulation 17 with all his force, as he had to oppose the abolition in Manitoba, in 1916, of the Compromise of 1897.

This issue of the place of French Canadian society as an autonomous social formation in any Canadian province, and therefore in all Canada, was in itself an acrimonious dispute about the fundamentals of the Canadian state. Unhappily, it had to be conducted under the rapidly growing strains of the Great War of 1914.

Canada had entered the war united, in anticipation of a short war of encounter fought with the means prepared for it. It became instead a long war of attrition fought by all possible means by all the manpower that could be raised. By mid-1917 both the demands of army and of war industry made it reasonable to propose that Canada should replace voluntary recruitment of its forces by conscription. Prime Minister Borden proposed that the need for men should be met by compulsory service, and invited Laurier as Leader of the Opposition to join him in a national government for the purpose. Laurier after much consideration declined to do so.

He did so as a party leader and as a Liberal. It was entirely reasonable to defend the continuation of voluntary recruitment. Australia, of which the war effort at least matched that of Canada, rejected it in each of two plebiscites. But there was another, profounder reason for Laurier and for Canada to ponder. That was that conscription would not be accepted in French Quebec. It was not that French Canada opposed Canadian participation in the war. It was not that voluntary recruiting among French Canadians of all provinces had not, despite much and incredible mismanagement, to a greatly less degree than among Canadians born English Canadians volunteered as freely as old stock English Canadians.[7] Nor was it that French Canadians were unwarlike and did not make good soldiers. The contrary was more than proved by the French units of the Canadian army. The reason was that French Canadian society in the homeland of Quebec, irritated by the denial of the bicultural principle since 1890 and particularly by Regulation 17 and the Manitoba School Act of 1916, refused to accept one of the ultimate exercises of state power, the enforcement of military service, by a state from it felt it had received less than justice and which it felt was not fully its own political expression, but one strange to the purposes and ethics of French Canadian society.

The results of the dispute over conscription were the passage of the Military Service Act, the splitting of the Liberal

7. Armstrong, Elizabeth, Crisis in Quebec, pp. 121-122

party, the formation of the Union Government; the election of 1917, and the alienation of French Canada from what had become the dominant purpose of English Canadian society, the winning of the war. After such a repudiation of Bourassa's concept of a French Canadian society as autonomous and fully developed part of a political union all Canadians might accept for its defined purposes, French Canadian nationalists turned from Bourassa to other leaders.

Much of that national sentiment had been, of course, saved for the Liberal party by Laurier's decision of 1917, and that party continued to be, provincially until 1936, federally until 1957./ the federal vehicle of French Canadian political purpose. But in its extremer form it turned back from Bourassa's broad and enlightened leadership to one more like that it had known in the days of ultramontane influence. This was the leadership of the historian, the Abbé, now Chanoine, Lionel Groulx. It was a leadership more historical, less political, less secular, less magnanimous, more intense, more clerical than that of Bourassa. But it was a leadership of force, insight and passion. Groulx set out to explain, and by explaining justify, the survival of French Canadian society. By so doing he laid the foundations for the study of French culture in America within and beyond the political borders of Canada, and of any Canadian province. It was a fresh, a novel, a non-political, assertion of the existence of a French society, historically meaningful and sociologically autonomous in America.

It is of course misleading to suggest that in Groulx's

nationalism there was simply a revival of ultramontane conservatism. The Roman Catholic Church in French Canada had changed with changes in the whole church, and particularly of two. One was the final secularization of education and the state in France early in the century. While one result was to intensify Catholic sentiment, another and more important was to reveal that the church might fulfil its task of the cure of souls within the state and without regard to the state. In short there might be no need either for the ultramontanes of Montreal or the informal and discreet gallicism of Quebec. The church had its own role to play.

This slowly appreciated truth was to percolate in the church in French Canadian society until it resulted in the great changes of to-day. The truth was reinforced by the second change, one of particular significance for Quebec. That province had been extensively industrialized since 1879 with the growth of manufacturing, hydro-electric, wood pulp, and mining industries. Less and less was French Canadian society a rural and agrarian society; more and more it was becoming industrialized and urbanized. The same changes had been proceeding in Europe, in both Europe and Quebec the social difficulties and tensions of industrialization and urbanization had occurred. To prepare the church to meet their social evils, Pope Leo XIII had issued the cyclical Rerum Novarum, which gave the church a social program for the new age, and opened the way for further change in doctrine and practice.

The Roman Catholic Church and French Canadian society were thus in fact in the process of responding to the social changes of their time. The conflicts over education and conscription were relatively superficial and out of date. The church had to concern itself henceforth at least as much with trades unionism among worker and secular thought in society, as with the relations of church and state. The nationalism of Groulx in consequence was not merely clerical and nationalist. It was cultural and sociological in its bearings, and transcended the old ecclesiastical and political issues.

How far this was true was revealed by the emergence for the first time since 1837 of the idea of an independent political state to embody French Canadian society. This Laurentian nationalism, for its few spokesmen proposed a French republic of Laurentia, was not at the time important or significant. It, however, raised the fundamental and unavoidable question in a discussion of biculturalism, of whether a society can be autonomous and fully expressed if united in one political state with another society?

This question was to recur and still awaits an answer. But French Canadian society, like the rest of the western world, had to endure the strains of the great depression of the 1930's. That great social catastrophe saw the last of the liberal nineteenth century world, with its counterpoint of liberalism with catholicism and conservatism, the century in which French Canadian society had emerged in its integrity, come to a prolonged and agonizing end.

It did not, however, come to an end in French Canada. It was, on the contrary, to last for a quarter of a century longer. The reasons were partly the inherent conservatism of French Canadian society, partly the extraordinary powers of endurance in that society, and partly the contingencies of events and personalities.

Those events and persons of course reflected features of the social and economic background of the time. As indicated above, French Canada had learned to use representative democracy, but had not incorporated it into its ethos. Similarly it had come to live under free enterprise capitalism, accepted the doctrines of laissez-faire and free enterprise, but did not incorporate them into its folkways and basic morality. In consequence Quebec politics seemed to be even more than those of the rest of the country subject to prolonged periods of party rule, to the emergence of party chefs of a political prominence little justified by political capacity or devotion to the public good. In consequence, big business and major industries in Quebec also were both remote from the outlook and moral sensitivity of the society from which it drew its labour force and which depended on it for livelihood and welfare. And the politicans of this superficial democracy and this enterprise both free of state interference and remote from social influences were in intimate alliance, an alliance of political corruption with business efficiency expressed in terms of low wages, feudal relations between management and labour, and a lack of social conscience

a Manchester mill owner might have envied. Coupled with these was a great lack of legislation for either individual or social welfare.

This alliance of political corruptness and economic obscurantism was embodied in the Liberal regime of Premiers Lomer Gouin and Louis Alexandre Taschereau which had governed Quebec since 1905. In retrospect that time of top-hatted politicians at Quebec, invariably French, and strong-featured tycoons in St. James Street, almost invariably English, seems as unreal at the time of grandparents always does. Yet it was actual, and the fact that men believed and acted as those men did reveals how French Canadian society, while developing in its own integrity beneath, had grown above itself a carapace of politics only nominally democratic and of business leadership almost wholly alien. Few if any other combination could have fitted a society less able to endure the great depression.

It was, at first glance, a classic Marxian situation; it was an all but perfect preparation for social revolution. Yet none occurred. Why? The reasons are first that Quebec was a province in a large political and economic state. It suffered and reeled through the depression with Canada as a whole. Second, while the situation was revolutionary, French Canadian society was not. Roman Catholicism in French Canada was popular, not privileged; it sprang from the people, and lived with the people,

the people themselves breathed Catholicism. There had not occurred in French Canada as there had in much of old France before the Great Revolution, as had occurred so drastically in Spain, that separation of church from people, like a scar peeling off a wound, because the church had become part of a privileged and unserviceable class system. There was therefore no revolution, only some attempt at fascism and some attempt at reform.

The fascism of Adrien Arcand was not important, and is significant only as indicating how French Canadian society, under sufficient strees, might move in the direction of popular absolutism and totalitarianism. The attempt at reform in the middle thirties was attempt to use the essential liberalism of Canadian democratic institutions to bring into Quebec life such reforms as had partly fitted the legal systems and societies of the other provinces to deal with the new conditions of society, and such as were being attempted in the United States by the New Deal. A leader in this attempt to modernize French Canadian society in Quebec was a young man with a well known political name, Paul Gouin. Idealistic and passionate, he revolted by founding L'Action Nationale Liberale, against the ingrained corruption and weary ineffectiveness of the Taschereau regime and its mechanical politics. He sought to provoke a rally of all elements in opposition to an effete regime and give the Province a dynamic government devoted to reform.

His efforts naturally attracted the attentions of the long unsuccessful Conservative opposition. The Conservative party in Quebec, when it had lost the Bleus to the Liberals in 1897, had become a reactionary party politically. It was allied with the clerical, nationalist, and socially ultra elements of French Canadian society. It was a party of bourgeois Bourbons who remembered Mercier and had forgotten Langevin. Gracious, well bred, of an almost Castilian protocol as its leaders were, it was yet a party with popular roots, the roots of the popular Catholicism of French Canadians. Having survived as a party the disasters of the 1890's, all it needed for success was a new Mercier who could combine Catholic sentiment with practical politics. The party was now to find such a chef in Maurice Duplessis, a French Canadian Conservative capable of taking up the popular cause.

Out of the idealism of Gouin and the opportunism of Duplessis was born the Union Nationale. It was an attempt to rally all good French men to defeat the strangling Taschereau régime, and liberate Quebec from the social bonds that bound it. The Union won the election of 1936, but Duplessis, not Gouin, was its leader, and it was Duplessis who became Premier. The rally for reform had in fact proved to be a conservative victory under the cloak of the Union Nationale. French Canadian society had rallied indeed against a corrupt regime and the deprivation of the depression, but it had rallied to assert its catholicism,

its sense of its past, its nationalisme, its own social integrity as it was, little changed or affected by politics or economics. It had elected in fact to remain in the late nineteenth century.

The first Duplessis government might have been, as it ought to have been, the last reactions of an element in French Canadian society to the overwhelming changes forced on all societies by the industrialization and urbanization of human society in this century. Certainly when Duplessis opposed Canadian entry into the war in 1939, he was defeated easily enough by the use of the full force of the federal and provincial Liberal parties in Quebec. In consequence Quebec received some measure from a Liberal government of those political and social reforms long accepted in most Canadian provinces. But that war, by raising again the inflamed issue of conscription, gave Duplessis his opportunity to return to power in 1944. Then was resumed that regime of political corruption, personal authoritarianism and and social and economic reaction that lasted until Duplessis' death in 1959. Not only was the regime socially reactionary. It was in fact the old alliance of corrupt politics and big business that had distinguished the Taschereau regime, but which now, faced with a growing labour movement and an increasing intellectual criticism, had to bend to reform or stand by reaction. Duplessis stood by reaction, and the most dramatic results were the savage clashes between the army-like Provincial Police and striking workers at Thetford and at Murdockville. If this

was what French Canadian nationalism meant, if this was the autonomy of French Canadian society called for, then it gave food for thought by all French Canadians.

Such food was already being supplied and, as was proper, la cuisine was French Canadian.

Le Devoir, for example, had become over the years steadily more intellectual and with the change steadily more critical, not only of English Canada, and of the state in the abstract, but also of the French Canadian society which it served. It became under distinguished editorship of André Laurendeau the intellectual conscience of French Canadian society. Le Devoir struck with every increasing precision at the monstrosity of the Duplessis regime. And the Faculty of Social Studies at Laval, free like Quebec City itself from the heat and irritation of Anglo-French pressures at Montreal, began under the leadership of Père Georges-Henry Lévesque, to bring modern social analysis to bear on Quebec politics and French Canadian society. This had far spread repercussions, especially in the matter of political corruption. The whole was symptomatic of the fact that a new generation of university-trained men in the natural and social sciences had brought into French Canadian society a new element, that of the cool, dispassionate intellect, trained to seek factual truth and to proceed to practical results. And in the church deep currents were running as the career of Bishop Charbonneau was to indicate, and that of Archbishop, now Cardinal,

Leger, was quietly to re-affirm when Charbonneau had been removed.

Even more dramatic was the effect on French Canadian society of the French Network of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; to a very great degree an autonomous body in operation and almost wholly so in the vital work of programming. By its work in radio it had already aided and extended the work of the press and of the novelists and poets in making French Canadian society self-conscious and self-critical. With the introduction of television in 1952, the influence of the Corporation became revolutionary. Now French Canada could see both itself and the rest of the world. It had found a mirror in which to see itself and the world. It could compare them; and the result was a disturbing and intoxicating mixture of pleasure and shame, pleasure to see a society so fresh and vigorous, so full of life and taste, so gifted in the arts, and yet so depraved politically, so reactionary economically, so poverty-stricken at the margins of its life. One result was an outburst of creative energy and self-criticism unequalled in Canadian history. Another was a bitter sense of betrayal by its own leaders, and of indifference and contempt on the part of English Canada. And there was yet another kind of demagoguery, always a force among a people addicted to rhetoric, the demagoguery of the television commentator. The chief of these was René Lévesque, a product of the

bitter and narrow life of the rural Gaspé and a master of the unspoken effect, who could by his fluent talk, unformed, undirected, but full of passionate overtones, hints, shrugs, innuendoes, arouse in his audiences all the bitter resentment of the French Canadian against the shortcomings of his own society and against the English environment which seemed to intensify them.

Out of these new growths and exciting disturbances in French Canadian society came a passionate resolution to reform the existing evils and to realize the full potentialities of that society. How was this to be done? The one political instrument French Canadian society controlled was the provincial government of Quebec. The powers of that government were limited by the federal constitution of Canada. Its financial means were similarly limited, the more so as Premier Duplessis, for alleged nationalist and social reasons, refused to accept grants from the federal government for specified purposes, such as federal grants to universities. French society had therefore to work within those limitations, as well as the subtle and all pervasive ones of the surrounding Anglo-American society of English Canada and the United States. Could this be done?

A royal commission under Judge Thomas Tremblay was set up in 1953 to investigate the possibility of the situation. It was inspired both by the growing pressure for change within French Canada itself, and also, as all that society was being, by the extraordinary restoration of the pride and vigour of old France

under Charles de Gaulle. The Tremblay Report, published in 1956, is one of the fullest and most systematic statements of French Canadian nationalism. Its purpose was to find a way for French Canada to live a life of its own within its circumstances. Its basic principle was that society possessed an integrity and autonomy of its own which should be able to realize its potentialities and accommodate itself within its circumstances. It recommended, in place of the centralized planning and central direction from Ottawa which had been the English Canadian response to the great depression, a similar planning, but a planning done provincially, or regionally. The initiative was to be local, with a stress on the social and economic needs of the locality, while the role of the central government would be to harmonize such plans in a practical whole, and to aid in the carrying out of the parts. It was an attempt to bridge the gap between the political opportunism of Duplessis and the social distinctiveness of French society in Canada on the one hand, and the position of Quebec in a federal system on the other.

Duplessis of course ignored such a report. In the hands of his successor, Paul Sauvé, it might have become an important public document in Canadian history. Sauvé's sudden death in 1959 in fact opened the gates to the "quiet revolution" that had been so long preparing. The death of the two Union Nationale leaders seemed to open the gates, but they were already bulging

and the strike of producers in the French network of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation may well have had more to do with the creation of the realization that French society in Quebec must and could work out its own destiny.

The quiet revolution was in fact a democractic, parliamentary change made dynamic by a refusal to accept old subordination any longer and a determination to use all existing powers, and if necessary to take new ones; to carry out the social, educational and legal reforms long necessary if French Canadian society was to be able, not only to exist in, but to participate in and enjoy the industrial civilization of North American in the twentieth century. It was quiet, partly because it was unopposed, partly because it was kept within the limits of a revivified provincial Liberal party led by Jean Lesage. Elected to power by a narrow majority in 1960, Lesage managed to keep office and add to his strength by giving the revolution its head, notably by bringing René Lévesque into his cabinet as Minister of Resources. That passionate radical thus had the task of carrying out great and fundamental changes while talking the language of such fervour as his hearers required, and of producing results with sufficient speed not to allow the Union Nationale, still strong enough to oust the reforming Liberals by a revival of the old appeal to nationalism couched in passionate and rhetorical terms that would change little.

Such a possibility was great, because however hard-headed and practical the objectives the revolutionaries had set themselves, the drive towards them was fired by national sentiment. Quebec might need greater public finances; it might need a reformed financial system; it might need public works honestly built to serve the public, it might need a planned and directed development of its natural and industrial resources; it might need a new educational system fitted to a scientific and industrial age; it might need direct and official relations with France and the outside world. All these, however, could be carried out only if they were acceptable to the highly sensitive and fiercely aroused national sentiment of French Canadian society itself. What had to be done had to be done for French society, by French society, and it had to be expressed in the phraseology and accents of that society. The revolution, therefore, if guided by a party and worked out by the corps of able and dispassionate university trained men assembled at Quebec City, had still to be a national revolution, or the Liberal party and the civil service would be repudiated in the name of nationalism itself.

How real this possibility is revealed not only by the continued strength of the Union Nationale, but also by the renewed growth of "separatism". Separatism, active in the

extremes of nationalist thought since the 1920's, is a matter of many moods and many shades of thought. It ranges from the outright demand for secession from and independence of the rest of Canada to a cultural and even a personal withdrawal from English Canadian influences. But essentially it is the resolve that French Canadian society should go it alone, should live its own life, and find the means to do so. Separatists are often not antagonistic to English Canada; they are merely distinct from it, as a Netherlander is, or a Siamese.

French Culture in Canada

The above outline of the development of French Canadian society from colonial times to the present day may be taken to suggest, among many other matters, two outstanding thoughts. The first is that there can be no question of the validity and significance of the concept of a French Canadian society. As a society it possesses uniqueness, integrity, and all the modes of social expression. The second is that that development has reached a critical, a revolutionary stage. French Canadian society will not from now be content with less than the full acceptance of its own uniqueness and integrity, and will insist on using all modes of cultural expression.

It will do so both because of its historical development and because of the present temper of its leaders. The first certainly equips it with the means to cultural autonomy. French Canadian society has as its own one of the foremost of the

world's languages. Through it it has access to one of the greatest of national cultures, to Europe's and South America's intellegentsia, and to hundreds of millions of Africans and Asians. Within French Canada itself the use of the language has suffered from its local origins in provincial dialects, and by the insinuating and constant erosion of English. Yet in cultured circles Canadian French is a strong and pleasing language, like the best American and Canadian English. And it has given rise to a notable and a rapidly flowering literature.

Next, French Canadian society possesses an unusual, even extraordinary, closeness of social texture. French Canadians are a kinship of great density. Only a few thousand men and women were the American ancestors of the some millions of French and Acadians to-day, and of the other millions of Franco-Americans. The startling unanimity of feeling that may occur in French Canada springs from the fact that all French Canadians are kin to one another. Few societies can be, or have been, so inter-related.

Yet this finely cohesive society has, because of its catholicism, an inherent sense of class structure. Class, however, is not an element of division in French Canadian society, or a source of social envy. It is a factor making for social stability, because the same family, bound by kinship, will exist across the class structure. Had the higher economic middle

class been French, and not English, class might have continued to be an element making for social stability, particularly as the labour movement became, as it is becoming, at once more under the control of French Canadian leaders and less under the influence of the church.

The replacement of a predominantly rural social and economic order by one predominantly urban and industrial has, of course, been a great strain upon the cohesion of French Canadian society.[8] The addition of masses of urban workers and dwellers to the agricultural populations, the additon of an industrial and managerial middle class to the old professional and commercial one, created a demand for more urban parishes with more sophisticated curés. It also produced the need of new social values, new goals in life, and new ways of viewing the family. The church had to adjust, for example, to the existence of powerful trade unions, and of a labour movement with its own theology and its own hierarchy of devoted labourers. The family had to adjust to the insistent and insidious demands of suburban residence and dormitory dwellings. The individual had to strike a balance between the demands of his moral and spiritual training and the trials and the rewards of an urban life which became ever more American in tone and temper. This process is still very much going on, and what the outcome will be it is difficult to guess. It is impossible not to expect that the integrity of French Canadian society will contain these stresses, and maintain itself, but

8. F. Ouellet, "Les Fondements historigues de l'option séparatiste dans le Québec, Canadian Historical Review, XLIII, (3) Sept., 1962, p.203.

there can be no doubt as to the strain under which it labours.

Closely related to the stresses imposed by industrialization and urbanization are the demands now made upon education. All members of society, in French Canadian society as elsewhere, have now to be highly trained, and so far as their native capacity allows, educated if they are to find useful and happy places in an technological and electronic society that has made so much traditional training and learning useless. Education in French Canadian society,under control of the church directly and indirectly from the primary years to advanced university study, was based on the assumption of a society of farmers and artisans having slight need of formal education, and of a secular and ecclesiastical élite requiring professional training in the arts, and in the law, medicine and philosophy. It was the pattern of education in Europe from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries. It did what it was supposed to do, sometimes with brilliant results. But it was not designed for a society fed, clothed, informed and employed by the technological application of scientific discoveries to almost all old occupations, not to speak of the host of new ones which had come into being because of the new materials and processes discovered. Because those who controlled education in French Canadian society maintained such a system of education too long, that society finds itself in the middle of the twentieth century with its agricultural and working people insufficiently educated, and with

far too few of its own leading minds trained in science and technology. French Canadian society, with its system of education, was as out of date as Taschereau's politics or the economics of St. James Street.

It may be said so boldly that the old French education system was out of date in large part because the fact has been recognized by leading minds in Quebec, as has been shown by the creation of a Ministry of Education and the reports of the Parent Commission on public education. It may also be said because of the evident effects on French Canadian society itself. The defects of French Canadian education are easy to overemphasize. But an emphasis on letters and philosophy without a corresponding emphasis on science and technology, has, in competition with English Canadians trained in a system of education that emphasizes mathematics and the sciences, denied to many able and ambitious French Canadians that ascent to positions of influence and reward which any fully developed modern society affords. In particular, it has denied them or given to the doubting reason to deny them, access to senior positions in Canadian government and business. This is resented by French Canadians and ascribed, no doubt with some justice, to English Canadian rivalry. It is certainly a grievous loss to French Canadian society and to all Canada.

In summary, the nature of the ethos and training afforded to its members by French Canadian society, admirable in so many ways, has been such as to make difficult or impossible for its

more ambitious members to take part in the higher manifestations of a society's cultural success. French society in Quebec has not known until the very recent past the real and far-reaching benefits skilled and informed governmental action may create in a society if government and society are in a genuine moral and popular accord. Government in modern society need not be, although politicians may make it seem to be, a paternal bestower of benefits. It is the instructed agent of society, seeking to clarify and realize the purposes of society. Government can only be so if it is directed by the best intellegence and keenest moral sense a society may produce.

Similarly, business has largely ceased to be personal and familial, the seeking of private profit by competitive means. It has become a social service also, at least where it has learned that its own success depends upon its own involvement in the society it serves, its relations with labour, with its patrons and with government. Again, success depends upon its being able to attract, and its willingness to appoint, qualified members of the society in which it operates and of which it ought to be a part. The society, for its part must be able, if it is to be a complete society, both produce the people needed, and insist on the behaviour required of business.

These areas of government and business are the chief in which French Canadian society, partly through its own deficiencies, partly through the faults of English Canadian society, has

failed to reach fulfilment as a culture in the North America of to-day.[9] This condition is changing, and must change rapidly. It cannot, and will not last. Equally higher manifestations of a complete society are professional success, education standards and artistic achievement. In the professions French Canadian society has done well, and might do better without fundamental change, although medicine and engineering need greater support from science. The standards of performance in higher education are rising rapidly. In artistic achievement French Canadian society is not only fulfilling itself triumphantly, but has achieved that relationship with the state which is needed and is being sought in all the other areas of government.

The last happy note prepares the way for saying that in fact, so fast are events moving in French Canadian society in Quebec that that society is beyond doubt on the verge of fulfilling itself within Quebec as a culturally mature society. French Canadian society therefore may be said to be in the Province of Quebec a society in the scientific sense; it is a way of life in which an individual may live a whole life, satisfying all the wants of a material, moral and aesthetic being.

The place of such a culture in biculturalism, however, can be examined only when the other culture has been analyzed.

The Culture of English Canada

The development and existence of a French culture, clearly definable and a social, economic and political fact, is one of

9. See the figures cited from Dr. John Porter's work on power élites in Canada, Peter Desbarats, The State of Quebec, p.43 Only 6.7% of that élite, by Porter's reckoning, is French Canadian.

the principal elements of Canadian history and of the present situation in Canada. To trace that development and describe that existence is a matter calling for care and some length in treatment. To turn, however, to discuss the development and existence of the English culture assumed by the use of the term "biculturalism" is to face a very different set of considerations.

To say that there is an English culture is indeed to assume a point of view natural enough to French Canada, but one not nearly, if at all, as defensible in scientific terms, or in practical fact, as is the existence of French culture. Here is the central dilemma of biculturalism. It assumes a duality of cultures which, if it does exist, is not at all symmetrical. The monolithic, so to speak for effect, French culture is counterpoised, not by a monolithic English culture, but by a society of the utmost diversity of behaviour and of thought. Yet withal there is in it a peculiar and pervasive uniformity, which is no doubt the most apparent aspect of it to a French Canadian observer. The diversity is to be explained by the facts that where French Canada is, for all practical purposes, uni-ethnic, English Canada is multi-ethnic, and is not even dominated by a single group, unless the four British peoples are to be considered such, a dubious proposition; and further that while French Canada with few exceptions adheres to the Roman Catholic faith, English Canadian religious affiliations range from Roman Catholicism through the Protestant to the non -

Christian faiths such as Confucianism, and even Mohammedanism. The conformity is explained by the general use of the English language, by the great and general degree of American influence in mass culture, and by the readiness with which English Canada divorces its cultural behaviour and beliefs from its political. It thus achieves uniformity, and even conformity, in the midst of diversity. Whether two cultures so different in character can in fact enter into the cultural duality required by biculturalism is the question now under discussion.

To carry on that discussion it is first necessary to examine the development of English Canadian society in order to judge whether it may be judged a culture that might be a twin to French culture in a mutually satisfactory partnership.

It is suggested here that the first thing to note about English Canadian society is that it was largely American in origin. There were exceptions, of course; the "residents" of Newfoundland came to that island direct from England and Ireland and are the least American (Canadian)elements in English Canada. So also did the English settlers in and around Halifax in 1749 and immediately thereafter. But much the greater number of settlers in Nova Scotia after the expulsion of the Acadians in 1755 were New Englanders, whose ancestors had been in America for over a century. And after them to Nova Scotia, including New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and to Canada, came

the Loyalists.

Because of their adherence to the cause of the unity of the British Empire, it is usually forgotten that the great bulk of the Loyalists were as American as their opponents in the War of Independence. The great majority of those who opposed the independence of the colonies remained in the United States, made their peace, and were among the ancestors of the Americans of to-day. Those who were driven into exile had no doubt done more for their political beliefs, but they were no less American, most of them, in ancestry and culture. Any study of their behaviour in the remaining British colonies reveals how American they were in expectations and behaviour, and in the institutions they founded. They were indeed so American that they found it difficult to get along with the British alongside whom they had fought.

The popular origins of English Canada were thus largely American, and so remained with few exceptions until after 1815. The Glengary Highlanders, and the Scots and Irish who came to the Maritime provinces were colourful, but not influential exceptions, and the American character of the Loyalists was greatly increased in the Eastern Townships of Quebec, and the western part of old Ontario, by the coming of thousands of Americans, some as "late" Loyalists, some as plain and simple land seekers. Considerable members both of Loyalists and later comers, moreover, were not of English descent, but of Scots and

and German origin.

Thus the original substratum of English Canada, little studied and little known, is in fact American, English and European cultures as modified by a century or more of American experience.[10] Much of what is not readily explained in the curious amalgam that is English Canada is explained by this fact. French Canadian society for the most part has nothing to parallel it; perhaps Acadian society has.

The American strain in English Canada, however, remained a substratum until the influx into western Canada early in this century. It in fact was curiously uninfluential in political and in superficially cultural matters. A strong vein of quietism has pervaded it, increased perhaps by a lack of a suitable political and social terminology. That is not to say that it has not been profoundly effective culturally. It would seem in fact to have been so, but it was overlaid and a new political and social vocabulary imposed by the strong tide of British immigration, both of people, ideas and habits, which flowed into English Canada from 1815 to 1914.

That British immigration was one tide, but there were three major and one minor currents in the movement, English, Irish Scottish, and Welsh. Great Britain includes three languages and cultures, and Ireland two. It is an error, in a discussion involving any discrimination, to group them as one, even if England is the dominant nation and English the prevailing language

10. See G. E. Reaman, The Trail of the Black Walnut

in the British Isles. To take the extremes, the Irish are perhaps even more different from the English than are the French. The latter at least once conquered England thoroughly, which is more than the English and Scots ever did the Irish. It is therefore better in this paper to treat the four cultures as being at least distinguishable and as in themselves contributing to the diversity of English Canada.

The English in Canada possess to-day the most invidious role of any element in Canadian life. They are, willy-nilly, the vestigial remnants of the imperial connection under which the British American colonies lived in fact until 1849, and nominally to an ever decreasing degree since. The role is not one to be easily dropped. It is to be remember, that the English, with their colonial American allies, entered Acadia and Canada by force of arms. Except for the vast territories of the Hudson's Bay Company, and British Columbia, of no significance in terms of population at the time, the English <u>conquered</u> Acadia and Canada. They remained there in the first instance in virtue of naval and military power. The leadership, as well as much of the manpower of their forces, was English. They thus became definitely a garrison element in Canadian life, and so remained until their troops left Quebec in 1871. The place and date might even be Halifax in 1907. The English Canadian may well have forgotten all this, but the non-English Canadian is to be understood if he remembers it.

For the effect was to leave the English Canadian in control at the top of Canadian society. The effect was heightened in colonial days both by attempts to introduce aristocratic elements and the Anglican Church as a state institution into Canadian society, and by the social influence of the British garrisons in London, Toronto, Montreal, Quebec and Halifax. And around these nuclei in the principal cities there was a circle of governmental and professional people in part at least drawn from English society.

It is these largely English elements that set the tone of the English aspect of English Canada. That they were not by any means the only English elements must be noted. The garrisons and civil servants, together with half-pay army and naval officers, were a relatively small part of the members of English who came to Canada between 1815 and 1914. Far more were English tenant farmers from northern England seeking new land, and urban middle class people and artisans seeking new opportunities in Canada, as their counterparts did in millions in the United States. Much of the population of Ontario and British Columbia, and an important part of that of the prairie provinces, are descended from such English stock. And to them were added after 1897 not only much more of the same, but also a considerable number of the lower classes of London and the great industrial cities. This flow from the English middle and working classes has in fact never ceased, but was large after 1945 and after

1956, and continues to this day.

To generalize as to what the cultural effect of a group so large and so varied culturally itself is of course extremely difficult. That the effect was great is apparent, but precisely what the effect was and is is by no means clear. Perhaps the first thing to note is that the influential positions of the upper members of this group enhanced the importance of specifically English aspects of Canadian life, the English language, English law, parliamentary institutions and English social and aesthetic values. As a result the social and ethical culture of English Canada possesses strong English overtones, a deliberate reserve, a preference for understatement, an emphasis on ethics over aesthetics, and an active humanitarianism.[11] Finally the leading elements of English Canada have tended to be dominant, along with the Scots and Protestant Irish, in professional and business life. Some addiction to the Conservative party, to the Commonwealth, and to the acceptance of Canada as it has been since 1867 are of course to be noted, although it would be surprising if this were not so.

Closely related to, but different in important respects from, is the position of the English in English Canadian society is that of the Scots. The Scots also came as soldiers and civil

11. Debarats, The State of Quebec, pp. 34-36.

servants, and indeed at times outnumbered English in such posts. They also came ~~not only~~ as poor immigrants, but as men of some substance or as well trained professional men and artisans. One prime minister of Canada, Alexander Mackenzie, was a Scottish stonemason by trade. The Scottish Canadian therefore has played much the same role in English Canadian society as the English, and has played it at least as effectively.

Yet it was played with important differences. For one thing, an important part of the Scottish immigration was Roman Catholic in religion, which was the beginning of the curious religious tie, which is also a gulf, between French Canadian society and English Canadians. For another the Scot had an unusual gift for assimilation, both into other groups and to his own. This he possessed despite a sense of kinship at least as keen as that of the French Canadian. It is not possible to explain this undoubted fact, demonstrated by population statistics, of the unusual power of the Scottish to disperse and intermingle in the general population of Canada, including in a measure, that of French Canada. Perhaps the mere fact of dispersion in settlement, and in both countryside and the towns helps explain the existence of the quality, but it seems more likely it was one acquired both from the diversity of Scottish society itself, made as it was of four peoples, and of the age

old need of Scots to migrate from their barren homeland and make their way in the world.

That they were eminently equipped to do, both by constraint and by systematic schooling provided for all. The prevailing Presbyterianism also gave the Scot a strong sense of duty and a vigor in poverty, while the schooling made him literate and articulate, and capable of defending his independence of mind and action in any society. Both kirk and schooling, moreover, made him much more a democrat, far more keenly aware than the English or the French could be of the moral equality of men. Hence, whatever the Scots might be in politics, they brought to Canadian social and political life a ready acceptance of the worth of every individual, an acceptance that fitted well with the same stress on the fundamental equality of men which was American in origin.

The Scot thus tended to correct the inclination to aristocratic pretensions of the English in Canada, and helped prepare the development of a society that was European in inspiration but American in manner and in its mode of growth. This was the Scots great contribution to English Canadian society. They greatly helped to bring the strong British influences from 1815 to 1914 into accord with the American necessities of Canadian life.

Over and above that, the Scots entered all walks of Canadian life. Lumbermen in the woods, farmers in the clearings from Antigonish to Glengarry and Temiskaming, they were also bourgeois

in the fur trade and factors in the timber trade. Merchants, bankers, railway builders, industrialists, lawyers, teachers, above all, doctors, they became a large part of the power élite of Canadian society, and seemed, even when they did not, to dominate the business and professional life of Canada. Some areas they both did and do, especially in accountancy.

This reinforcement by the Scots of the English in government, business and the professions, was unfortunately also a confirmation of one of the gravest weaknesses of the English, their almost complete lack of care for the arts. Each nation had been made by the Reformation a primarily literate people. Literature, almost alone among the arts, remained respectable among the English and Scottish middle classes. Whereas, however, the English were Puritans in aesthetics without knowing why and without practising more than a neglect of the arts and of the refinement of taste, the Scots tended both to know why they were not inclined to aesthetic tastes, and to insist that it was a good thing. Moreover, it was expensive and took money from investment. The two peoples thus unhappily confirmed one another in the most important areas of cultural life, and produced that contemptuous and almost savage resistance to any form of art without a declared moral purpose that has characterized English Canadian society until recent times.

The Anglo-Scottish are thus distinct, but closely related groups. The third set of British people to be examined is both

closely related to the Anglo-Scottish, and very different. That is, the Irish group is divided within itself. The Irish consist of the true Irish, descendants of the original Celtic population, and Roman Catholics in faith, and of the Anglo-Irish descended from the English invaders and settlers, with the Scots-Irish descended from the plantings of Ulster in the seventeenth century. All three divisions came in large numbers to Canada, and all are very important influences in English Canadian society.

The most numerous and the most significant for the discussion of the culture of English Canadian society were the native, Catholic Irish. Almost invariably, as a result of the English conquest, dispossessed and impoverished tenant farmers, or even mere unskilled, and unlettered labourers, at best lower middle class tradespeople and artisans, the Catholic Irish flooded into the Maritimes and the two Canadas in such numbers as to become a group, comparable in numbers and importance with the French and the English. They were the true third force in Canada in the second half of the nineteenth century, and in a way that no such force exists to-day. In by far the greater part desperately poor, and not infrequently starving, they formed the larger part of the proletariat of the timber trade, along with the French Canadian, and of the dockside and shipyard working the ports, Halifax, Saint John, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto. Fortunately for themselves and Canada land was available for the labourers and the Catholic Irish, to a greater degree than in

the United States, spread out into the countryside. They thus achieved a good deal of the dispersion of the Scots, and the Celtic and Catholic became one of the chief strains of English Canadian society. (It also entered that of French Canada.)

It is difficult to say what the native Irish brought to English Canada, except their exquisite human qualities of humour, mood, and good fellowship. The group was firm in one thing only, its adherence to the Roman Church. In all else it followed its heart on the way to success. The climb of the Irish to success by way of politics and the professions, is a considerable chapter of English Canadian social history. A certain fecklessness, a certain charm, as in Morley Callaghan's writings, a certain gaiety and daring, but little in the way of speech, values, or institutions, the Irish Catholics gave to Canada. Their role seems to have been that of an amalgam, almost a matrix, in which the harder elements of English Canadian society might settle and be reconciled. The group has had almost a feminine part to play in the slow fusing of the elements of English Canada.

Quite different has been the parts played by the Anglo and the Scots Irish. The former, the governing and educated class of Ireland for a century and a half before they began to settle in Canada, were to make perhaps a greater stamp on the institutions of Canada, political and educational, than did any other group in Canada. The work of the Baldwins, father and son, in

bringing responsible, British parliamentary, government to Canada is well known. The influence of the Humes, the Sullivans and the Blakes on law and higher education is not so widely known, but is a matter of record. This Anglo-Irish group was in fact the intellectual centre of Canadian institutional development in the years of creation, 1840-1867, and the intellectual tone and temper of English Canada, quiet, dry and humorous, derives from these people, and the traditions they founded instil, for example, the government of Canada and the University of Toronto. The same qualities were sprinkled throughout Canadian life as the countrymen of the above distinguished leaders mingled easily with the English and Protestant Scottish, and spread through all levels of government, the professions, and even some forms of business, although they were not greatly inclined to commerce or industry.

Different again were the Scots-Irish. A dominant, but not a governing group in Ireland before the immigration to the United States and Canada, they had a garrison, a frontier mentality. Industrious, honest, morally fervent, kindly, among their kin, they were suspicious of and hostile to the people they had dispossessed, whether "wild Irish" or "wild Indians", and could be pitiless, domineering, and even murderous in their conduct towards them. It was largely these people who, with the Jacobean English, brought into American life the tradition of violence it has contained since.

In the life of English Canadian society, the Scots-Irish increased the garrison mentality, and the sense of being the governing class in Anglo-Scottish society. They, as the original Orangemen, greatly inflamed the animosity that had smouldered since the Reformation between Protestant and Catholic. In short, the Scots, Irish, and the native Irish brought with them from Ireland, the ancient, unhappy feuds of Ireland, and English Canadian society had as one of its principle tasks, and one of its unacknowledged successes, in the containing and gradual stifling of an enmity that became pointless in Canada. In the process the granitic element, the legal mind, the soldier's stiffness, the sense of race, the quest of success, was strengthened in Canada. And with the increase of these qualities came a fiery dose of the Celtic fervour that made the Ulster Irishman a Scotsman galvanized. English Canada acquired in them its dominant and most enduring people, a people steeled to resist almost any cultural or religious pressures, an interesting element in a bicultural society.

The Irish elements in English Canadian society, then, have had two contradictory roles to play. The Scots and Anglo-Irish have reinforced the English element and exaggerated their qualities with both a hardening of intellectual quality and an intensifying with a more than Celtic fervency of garrison and Protestant militancy. The Celtic and Catholic Irish have in fact softened and humanized the Anglo-Scottish mass, but have not

wholly succeeded, in some areas and some ways have notoriously failed, in bridging the religious and cultural gap between the two cultures of biculturalism. In this failure language has perhaps been the principal element, as it has been the great divider also between Scots and French Catholic. The whole effect has been both to increase the diversity of English Canadian society and mark it off even more from that of French Canada.

The Welsh have not altered this general effect. Few in numbers though definite in character, they would seem, except in a few mining communities, to have to made no particular mark on English Canada. With them, as with nearly all immigrants, the new environment has operated to increase, not any nationalism they may have had in the old country, but to quicken and complete any tendencies they may have had towards absorption into a larger community. The Welsh, despite the survival of their language, and a strong local national movement, were in fact far advanced towards such absorption into the general society of the British Isles.

The common culture of English Canada thus emerges in a very definite social formation. It is headed by a dominant high bourgeoisie, or middle class, which is dominant in all respects, social, economic, political and aesthetic, in English Canada, and economically dominant, as yet, in French Canada. It is also a fully formed society with a distinct and complete class structure,

coupled with North American social mobility. Its members include all social and economic types, from business executives and highly skilled doctors and lawyers to poverty-ridden fishermen in Newfoundland to proletarian longshoremen in British Columbia; to economically trapped farmers in New Brunswick and Northern Ontario and eastern Manitoba to wandering trappers and prospectors in the North-West Territories, with all degrees of highly skilled technicians and machinists, clerical workers and small tradesmen in between.

Class relations and social mobility are still easy, but class divisions and the difficulties of social rising; however modified by public systems of education and higher learning, are great and are not becoming easier to cross or to accomplish.

Certain common characteristics may, however, be suggested. English Canadian society is not, at least overtly, a conscious class society. It proclaims, and still accepts the desirability and possibility, of social equality, or at least of the maintenance of tolerable degrees of inequality. It is still a society of order attained by the self-discipline of the individual, usually aided by his church. It is pragmatic in temper, testing matters by their working. It is simple in habit, desires and achievements. It is largely uncultured, or unrefined, in all matters of taste or subtility of distinction.

Its members are generally conscientious, courageous, and privately honest. In public affairs it practices corruption with restraint, and tolerates ill-doing only within undefined but

strongly held limits. It can be relied on to show its best qualities under stress. In normal times it and its members, while exhibiting an easy friendliness, tend to be ungracious and cold. These qualities, so far as they exist, do not make for the easy practice of bicultural relations.

Other elements in English Canadian society are not, of course, English except in the sense that their members use English, by far the greater number of them, as their general and public language. More and more use it privately also.

Of these the oldest element in Canadian society, and the largest in number is the German. From the settlement of Lunenburg in 1751 to the present day German people in some number have migrated to Canada. They have for the most part, until recent times at least, kept in the background of Canadian life. Devoted to their callings and their families, conservative in all social ways, they have been one of the sub-strata of Canadian society, accepted, respected and little known. They have been, however, a factor of social and economic stability, and a distinct flavour in Canadian life, and the names of Canadians of recent distinction reveal how in fact English Canadian society is moving towards a novel amalgam, or fusion.

In all this, however, it is not apparent that the German Canadians have made any distinct cultural contributions, in social custom or belief, or in any social trait in sport, amusement, or the arts. This is the real test of whether the minor

population elements, such as the Germans, have in fact made any peculiar difference to the nature of English Canadian culture. This observation has nothing whatever to do with the interest or value of respective cultures, or the importance of one language in comparison with another. It is merely a matter of fact with respect to numbers of people and the opportunities of particular cultures to flourish.

In this light it is possible to say that as yet that even strong and distinctive cultures of ethnic minorities, such as the Icelandic, or the Ukrainian, have as yet made no real difference to the nature of English speaking culture. No social habit, or belief, no cultural taste or trait, no institutions or linguistic usage, is to be traced in the general Canadian society to either of these groups. This is not to say that they may not be, or that new elements, such as the Italians or the Hollanders, may not contribute distinctive elements to Canadian life. What it is to say is that such groups do increase the popular diversity of so called English Canada, but that their contribution to its character is general and substantial, not specific and distinctive. Above all, what they do collectively is to make it impossible for English Canadian society and culture to be simple, unitary and cohesive as is the society and culture of French Canada. The implications of this fact for biculturalism are evidently of the first importance.

Before discussing them, however, it is necessary to discuss

one of the most important influences on English Canadian society, the historic, current, and daily influence of the vast and dynamic society of the United States. This is an influence on French Canadian society also, one perhaps whose force has not been valued at its actual extent, but French Canada has considerable protection from the difference in language. English Canada, on the other hand, is open to American influence in every pore of its being.

The influence of American society on that of both English and French Canadian society must simply be said to be flatly and completely opposed to biculturalism. American society has always insisted on the prevalence of English as the sole official and social language of the United States. This imperative of American society contravenes the principle of bilingualism which has been taken in this paper to be a necessary part of biculturalism. Next American society assumes, for all its enormous hospitality to many forms of diversity, regionalism, ethnic pride, etc., a common culture. Americanism has no place for biculturalism, at least for the formal acceptance of biculturalism as part of a scheme of lasting national organization.

American society, and the influence of that society, is thus profoundly and deliberately opposed to the concept and practice of biculturalism. There is little or nothing in English Canadian society with its multi-ethnic origins and its diversity of cultural strains, to resist this influence. English Canadian society is in fact very like American society. It is a

society of diverse origins which seeks uniformity by the use of a common language and the practice of many and often subtle forms of social conformity, which range all the way from the blatancies of advertising to the quiet social supremacy of certain clubs and certain jobs.

In short, while the culture of French Canada is unmistakably and by all accepted tests a culture, that of English Canada and of the United States are probably not strictly to be termed cultures. To employ a distinction once made, and perhaps still to be employed to make a distinction between "culture" and "civilization", English Canada and the United States are civilizations rather than cultures - or variants of the same civilization, another matter for the moment. That is, they accept a mingling of a diversity of cultures in the expectation that there will emerge a new society, founded on certain political and philosophical principles, but in its social and moral texture different from, and enriched beyond, any of the old.

The above discussions raises two questions. One is, can such a society as that of English Canada seem to be linked with the society of French Canada in the relationship called biculturalism? The other is, can a society which is in many of its aspects only a variant of another, larger, and more dynamic society enter into the kind of relationship biculturalism implies with a society as different from American society as is that of French Canada? To put the question briefly, is English Canada society sufficiently different from American society to be

linked intimately with French Canadian society, which is distinctly different from American? Or, how different, if at all, is English Canadian society from American?

It is already apparent that English Canadian culture is more like that of the United States than it is like that of French Canada. It is in fact a form of Anglo-American culture, or civilization. It is, perhaps, a culture which is American, but is American with differences, American with reservations. Nor are these differences and reservations, it is suggested here, merely superficial, mere matters of interest and taste, such as the relative interest shown in hockey and football, or the degrees of relative demand for cocktails and highballs. (Even in these superficialities, there are puzzling questions to be found. English Canada shares the French passion for hockey, and the American passion for football. French Canada does not, but more martinis are consumed per capita in Montreal, so the writer is informed on learned authority, than in any other city of North America. Research on the relative incidence of cocktails and highballs generally awaits adequate backing from some interested foundation.) The differences and reservations are in fact profound, and arise from the very different histories and geographies of the two North American countries.

What, to take examples as concrete as may be, is the attitude of English Canada towards three of the principle traits of

American society, the equality of men, the supremacy of the popular will, and the desirability of conformity?

Before attempting answers, it is necessary to deal with objections that the last trait may well arouse. It would be natural to object that conformity is not a principal trait of American society, that in fact the stress in American society has been put upon individualism, the importance of freedom under law, the religious significance of the individual. This of course is so, and is the basis for the American insistence on the importance of private enterprise, of the individual being free to exploit the economic and other opportunities left open to him in a society in which the power and the authority of the state and the general community are limited and the individual person given the maximum of freedom compatible with the necessary preservation of social order. In fact, however, individualism, together with equality, and the demands of assimilation in a society of diverse origins,have combined to produce an emphasis on conformity to accepted standards which is curiously anti-individualistic. This is so much a matter of common observation as to strike not only students of American society, but even newcomers to the American scene. The conformity is not willed; it occurs because the free pursuit of individual ends must lead to all individuals becoming alike. It is not only not willed; it is regretted. The nostalgia aroused by the westerns available for viewing in many American homes evening after evening is a response to a world in which the individual (gunman) was on his

own, and was entangled in no difficulty out of which he could not shoot his way.

As to equality, English Canada accepts the principle as readily as the United States; it is indeed even less ready to acknowledge and less capable of rewarding merit and distinction than is the United States. But it is more realistic and much more pragmatic in its acceptance of actual inequality of wealth and position than the United States. To the American great wealth and high social prestige are the prizes of individual effort, and the justification of one form of equality, that of opportunity. To Canadian dourness they may be more likely to appear the results of good luck or good management. These qualities do not in fact alter the essential equality of men as beings of whom on the whole little is to be expected except that they will accept good fortune as the reward of merit rather the result of social accident. Or they may appear dubiously won gains of a sharpness that leaves little room for humanity. In short, a somewhat greater cynicism, or perhaps a more insistent pragmatism, leads the Canadians to take men for what as persons they are, and to be sceptical of the intrinsic worth of rank or riches, or of a principle of equality that maybe a guide to conduct, but bears little relation to things as in part they are.

As to the supremacy of the popular will, English Canadian society is democratic at least to the same degree as American, but more on a Swiss or a Scandinavian model than the American. Canadian government is exceptionally conscious of public temper

and desire; it uses authority so little as to be almost permissive in its attitudes. Yet it has never lost a sense that government, however limited and however responsible, has a life and duty of its own, which is to govern, whether the popular will is clear or confused. The popular will is of course supreme, but it is not cognizant of detail, or interested in principle, or clear on new issues. Government must therefore proceed in the public interest, and those governing must seek to serve that interest in terms of the accepted maxims and routines of government. American government is not of course absolutely democratic; it does not cease because the electorate has not spoken. But in English Canadian society there is not the same impulse to instruct or oppose government frequently and regularly that is written into the American system of government. Canadian government, up to a point, can and is expected to run itself.

As to the desirability for conformity, there is in part a greater apparent conformity, extending even to accent, in the simpler society of English Canada than in the United States. The same is true of popular beliefs, manners, and aspirations. This, however, is more a matter of practice than of principle. The attitude towards the Communist party, Red China, the national flag, and other challenges to, or symbols of, English Canadians, or Canadian society, surely point to a greater tolerance of differences, a greater individualism at bottom. The English Canadian, as it is suggested, may practise conformity as much

as the American, but he does not accept it as something desirable in itself. It is at best a way of avoiding minor social irritations.

If on these points there are differences, which is admittedly an arguable matter, what are the real differences between English Canadian and American cultures? It is suggested here that the difference is one of emphasis, or of precedence. This difference is at bottom that of the relative role of tradition in the two societies. In Canada tradition comes before popular will, in the United States after. This is also true of equality and conformity. English Canadian culture, that is, is primarily an historical growth, with all the accidents, the roughnesses, and the continuity of historical growth. American society, on the contrary, is primarily an imagined, aspired to and created society. When imagination and words have failed, then armies have taken over, as in the War of Independence and the Civil War. The United States is what a majority of its people have willed it to be, not without traditions or history, of course, but in their own interpretation of history and tradition. Canada is what it has become, by growth, by accident, by experiment, but rarely, except for Confederation, by design. If English Canadian society in fact is primarily a historical and a traditional growth, it is possible that at bottom English Canadian culture is closer to that of French Canada than of the United States.

Another difference, not to be explored here, because it is a result of environment and not of culture, is that the climate and terrain of Canada, taken as a whole, require responses from the Canadian people, both French and English, different in considerable degree from those possible in the United States. Thus the role of government in development and that of commercial monopoly in business are necessarily greater under Canadian conditions than under American. In this also English and French Canadians are led to attempt collectively and by public action what in the United States might be done as well, or better by private enterprise. The factor must be noted because in fundamental ways it probably affects cultural development and could assist the working of biculturalism.

The French and English Cultures - A Summary

What in brief, then, is to be said of the French and English cultures after such an analysis, brief and superficial as it is?

French culture, in the light of the above discussion, is to be described as being uni-ethnic, uni-credal, familial, integral, and hierarchical. Its people share a common language, many with English as a second language, and a common national origin in which any original regional differences have been lost. With few exceptions, all French Canadians are Roman Catholics. They are tolerant of other faiths, but in general firm adherents of their own. French Canadian society has had, and still has despite the influences of industrialization and urbanization, a central and fundamental place for the family. All French Canadians are

kin. And that society has been hierarchical in its thought, and definitely authoritarian in temper. It readily accepts the concept of chef, of degrees of social and professional achievement and status, and of an ordered collectivity.

French culture is, then, the expression of a society highly conscious of its cohesion and unity. It tends therefore to feel, think and express itself as a group, as a collectivity.[12] It has achieved a self-consciousness and an autonomy complete in every respect except political independence. It exhibits all the scientific indications of a culture except the last.

English Canadian culture, or civilization, on the contrary, is multi-ethnic, multi-credal, social, diverse. It implies assimilation to established but changing social and political ideas, and practises without professing conformity. English Canadian society, that is, even in its dominant and central group, the Canadians of British origin, contains people of different national origins most of whom to some degree remain conscious of those origins. It contains members of other religions than the Christian, some of no religion at all, and tends to carry toleration to the point of indifference. Not only are the ties of the English Canadian community social, but those of family and kin are both less binding than the same ties in French Canadian society, and are loosened and frayed far more by industrialization and urbanization than those of French Canadian society. The family has largely ceased to be an economic unit; its position

12. Ramsay Cook , "The Canadian Dilemma", International Journal, XX (1) Wintes, 1964-65, pp. 1-19.

as a biological and sentimental one has been much reduced. As its members are individuals first, so are its elements drawn from diverse origins which become progressively less and less significant. Assimilation, even within the "mosaic" concept is proceeding rapidly. With assimilation, under the powerful influences of public school systems, modern advertising, and the mass media, comes a growth of conformity within the group.

In the broadest and latest meaning of culture, English Canadian society is a culture in itself. It provides for the necessities of human life, habits, beliefs, manners, learning, opportunity, individual and even political independence. In these terms it is thus a culture as is that of French Canada, but enjoys political independence also except insofar as it must conform with the fundamental needs of French Canada.

Yet English Canadian culture is not wholly a culture like that of French Canada, even when the question of political independence is left aside. The culture of French Canada is organic. It has grown from its own roots and has been nourished only by its own sap. The only artificial aspect of its growth has been the deliberate efforts exerted to maintain it against Anglo-American erosion. The culture of English Canada, however, is not in the same sense organic of having grown from a single root and of being fed from a single source. It is rather synthetic, even if the synthesis has been an organic rather than a mechanical

synthesis. It is a culture that has grown by incorporation as well as by inner formation.

The consequence is that the two cultures are not twins; they are not identical in nature, though each is a culture. It follows that their union in biculturalism cannot be that of a simple linking of identities. It must be, if it is to be, a symbiosis of differences. Biculturalism must be in Canada a cultural duality.

Biculturalism in Practice

There is of course biculturalism in Canada now. The question is not whether biculturalism exists, or whether it is practised in some fashion now; the question is whether biculturalism is to be appraised, accepted and made, with bilingualism, an acknowledged and functioning part of government and society in Canada. In short, how might biculturalism, so accepted, consciously function as part of Canadian life?

In answer to that question, two others must be posed and answered. First, is biculturalism to function as a synthesizing agent in Canadian life? Because of the nature of French Canadian culture, and the present circumstances and disposition of French Canadian society, the answer for French Canada is no. Biculturalism as a synthesizing agent could only be destructive of French culture, and would therefore defeat itself.

For English Canadian society, given the nature of that culture and the circumstances and disposition of that society,

together with the strong American influences to which it is so open, cannot but be disposed to answer yes. Such an answer, however, if accepted and applied in policy, would in effect be a rejection of biculturalism.

Biculturalism therefore cannot be a synthesizing agent in Canadian life, except over the certain opposition of French Canada.

Is biculturalism, then, to draw a metaphor from biology, to be symbiotic in its nature and functioning? In symbiosis two distinct organisms live together, each distinct yet each dependent on and necessary to the other. In a bicultural symbiosis the two cultures would be discrete, each living its own life, each continuing to be itself indefinitely, yet each necessary to the life of the other.

Is a bicultural symbiosis acceptable to Canada? If the discussion is confined to purely cultural matters, the answer of a majority of French Canadians would probably be yes. Would it be acceptable to English Canadians? In the abstract and in terms of the principles of their culture, the answer would be no.

What then is practical in biculturalism for Canada? Only a symbiotic biculturalism, it is submitted, could be accepted by French Canadian society. English Canadian society, because of its looseness of principle in social and cultural matters, and because of its almost endless reserves of pragmatism, could accept bicultural symbiosis for a time.

Such an agreement, however, could be made tolerable and put into effect in the institutions of Canada only if bilingualism were developed to the point at which by the working use of the two languages, in business, government, the arts and thought, come between the two cultures were made easy, continuous and harmonious. A symbiotic biculturalism cannot be allowed to be the perpetuation of "two solitudes". If it were to do so, English Canada would probably become more and more American; French Canadian society might lose the buffer of English Canadian society against itself being overwhelmed by direct and unqualified American influence, a buffer which English Canada is and could continue to be.

It is possible, therefore, to suggest that in the light of the above discussion two cultures may be taken, despite their important differences, to exist in Canada, and that they may be made the basis of a bicultural duality in the life, institutions and government of Canada.

The acceptance of a symbiotic biculturalism assumes the development of bilingualism in all the advanced levels of Canadian business, government; thought and art, and the systematic teaching of French in the schools of Canada, as the language of instruction in areas of French population, with English as the second language, and the teaching of English as the language of instruction in all areas of English speaking population, with French as the second language taught. Whether as a third language is taught might be a matter of localoption, but is a question that does not arise in this context.

Whether the cultural duality suggested may in fact be limited to cultural matters only, or must be extended to political matters also, is a matter for most serious consideration. Examples of both success and failure in attempting cultural pluralism together with political unity may readily be cited, in Switzerland and Belgium, for examples. It would be a matter of far different difficulty to explain either success or failure. In Canada the question has not really been studied. Perhaps the nearest approach to such a study is to be found in the essays by Pierre Eliott Trudeau and Norman Ward on "Politics/Vie Politique" in Canadian Dualism.[13]

What does seem to be basic to the achievement of success is to assure both societies that the federal power, or the national majority, shall not have authority in cultural matters, except to maintain cultural rights by remedial action. Duality does mean politically that there shall be autonomy within political union. Autonomy means that the matters in which there is autonomy shall not be subjects of federal political authority, except insofar as it may be expedient to have the federal government maintain, or guarantee them against infringement by any other authority provincial or municipal.

In the opinion of this writer, it is not impossible to devise constitutional powers and forms appropriate to the maintenance and enjoyment of both cultural duality and political unity. Only in such a context is biculturalism meaningful or possible.

13. Mason Wade (ed.) Canadian Dualism, pp. 239-276.